

I N D E X

Thursday, July 16, 1959

	Page
<u>Law Amendments Committee, Report (Mr. Lyon)</u>	981
<u>Introduction of Bill 89, re Business Development (Mr. Evans)</u>	981
<u>Introduction of Bill 58, re Statute Law (Mr. Carroll)</u>	981

Proposed Resolutions

<u>Bill 14, re School Grants (Mr. McLean)</u>	981
Mr. Miller, Mr. McLean	982
Mr. Miller, Mr. Hryhorczuk, Mr. McLean	983
<u>Bill 51, re Municipal Board (Mr. Thompson): Mr. Gray, Mr. Prefontaine</u>	984
Mr. Thompson; Mr. Prefontaine, Mr. Paulley, Mr. Groves	985
Mr. Groves, Mr. Paulley, Mr. Hillhouse	986
<u>Bill 52, re Public Utilities Board (Mr. Carroll): Mr. Gray, Mr. Hillhouse, Mr. Carroll</u>	986
<u>Statement on Exam Papers, Mr. McLean</u>	987
<u>Questions</u>	988
<u>Announcements: Mr. Christianson, Mr. Corbett</u>	990
<u>Third Reading: Bills 2, 3, 11, 26, 27, 30</u>	991
Bill 45	992

Second Readings

<u>Bill 6, re Social Security (Mr. Johnson, Gimli)</u>	993
Mr. Hillhouse	994
Mr. Gray, Mr. Wright, Mr. Prefontaine	995
Mr. Gray	996
Mr. Groves	997
Mr. Prefontaine, Mr. Groves, Mr. Orlikow	1000
Mr. Shoemaker	1001
Mr. Guttomrson, Mr. Johnson (Gimli)	1002
Division	1005
<u>Bill 23, re Child Welfare (Mr. Johnson, Gimli)</u>	1007
<u>Bill 56, re Teacher Society (Mr. McLean)</u>	1007
<u>Bill 82, re Mineral Taxation (Mr. Evans)</u>	1007
<u>Bill 83, re Pipe Lines (Mr. Evans) Mr. Gray, Mr. Paulley, Mr. Campbell</u>	1008

Committee of Supply

<u>Mines and Natural Resources: Answers to Questions, Mr. Evans</u>	1010
Fisheries Branch, Statement, Mr. Evans	1014
Discussion and Questions	1019
Predator Control	1035

THE LEGISLATIVE ASSEMBLY OF MANITOBA
8:00 o'clock, Thursday, July 16th, 1959

MR. SPEAKER: Second Reading of Bill No. 23. The Honourable the Minister of Health and Welfare.

Mr. Johnson (Gimli) presented Bill No. 23 for second reading.

Mr. Speaker read the motion.

MR. JOHNSON (Gimli): Mr. Speaker, the principle of this Bill is complementary to the Social Allowances Act in carrying forward the government's welfare policy. There are three main amendments contained in this Act; (1) It changes the power of the Juvenile Court to make maintenance orders for neglected children, instead of against the municipality against the director. (2) The rate of maintenance is to be set by the Public Welfare Advisory Committee rather than the Rate Establishment Committee, which formerly consisted of municipal representatives. Part (3), the Mothers' Allowance provision of the Child Welfare Act is repealed as they are covered in the new Social Allowances Act; this concerns where mothers widowed or deserted over four years and this, of course is changed in the new Social Allowances Act. That is the principle contained in Bill No. 23.

MR. GRAY: Mr. Chairman, children -- are they being placed in foster homes or in institutions?

MR. JOHNSON (Gimli):try and maintain them in foster homes. Twenty years ago nearly all foster children were placed in institutions and that figure has now reversed itself, pretty well, and we try these children who are neglected and we do all that we can to place them in foster homes.

After a voice vote, Mr. Speaker declared the motion carried.

MR. SPEAKER: Second Reading of Bill No. 56. The Honourable the Minister of Education.

Mr. McLean presented Bill 56 for second reading.

Mr. Speaker read the motion.

MR. McLEAN: This Bill -- the provisions of this Bill have been requested and approved by resolution at their annual meeting of the Manitoba Teachers' Society. It is required, or it follows in a sense, the formation of school divisions and provides simply for the change of the local association from District Association to Division Association, the election of officers of that association and the election of the representatives from each Division association to the central or provincial executive. As I say, the provisions have all been approved by the annual meeting of the Manitoba Teachers' Society.

After a voice vote, Mr. Speaker declared the motion carried.

MR. SPEAKER: Second Reading of Bill No. 82. The Honourable the Minister of Mines and Resources.

Mr. Evans presented Bill No. 82 for second reading.

Mr. Speaker read the motion.

MR. EVANS: Mr. Speaker, the main purpose of this Bill is to correct what is regarded as an injustice in taxing certain oil wells. The oil wells themselves are valued on the basis of the annual production of oil from each well. That more or less establishes the value of the well, then the mill rate is applied to that value and the Provincial Mineral Tax is applied. According to present regulations, a well that has produced for only a portion of a year -- we had one case as small a portion as two weeks in a year -- has that rate of production pro-rated over the entire year, for arriving at the value. The case that I refer to resulted in a tax, in that case, somewhat larger than the total value of production for that year. So the purpose of this is to correct that injustice and allow the well for that particular year to be valued only on the oil it produced in that year. There is another provision in the Bill -- formerly appeals were made to the Municipal Assessment Equalization and Appeal Board, but since that board will by virtue of other legislation cease to exist, amendments are necessary to make provision for appeals being made to the Municipal Board. Those are the two principles of this Bill:

MR. GRAY: Mr. Speaker, is there any intention of the government at this session or future session to adjust any injustice as far as the royalty of the oil is concerned.

MR. EVANS: If the honourable member would explain to me what he means by the

(Mr. Evans, Cont'd.) injustice -- what particular injustice he has in mind?

MR. GRAY: Yes, the injustice is that the government is not getting enough royalty from the oil.

MR. EVANS: I should think my reply on this occasion would be much the same as I did the other evening.

MR. GRAY: One of these days you'll change it.

After a voice vote, the Speaker declared the motion carried.

MR. SPEAKER: Second reading of Bill No. 83.

Mr. Evans presented Bill No. 83 for second reading.

Mr. Speaker read the motion.

MR. EVANS: Mr. Speaker, there is present legislation which enables the Lieutenant-Governor in Council to exempt from the provisions of the Pipelines Act any pipeline which is less than ten miles in length. The reason for that is that it does not require the company, in the first place, to file plans and get approval for this short pipeline which is in all cases merely a feeder pipeline, or a soft-water disposal pipeline. That is the reason for enabling them to be exempt from the Pipeline Act and its necessity of filing plans and seeking approval before that short pipeline is built. The purpose of the amendment is to give the Minister power to provide that exemption for a pipeline that is less than five miles in length -- there being so many of these short connecting pipelines, and it would be a convenience to have that power in the hands of the Minister.

MR. GRAY:does it apply on water pipes or on oil, isn't it?

MR. EVANS: Both pipelines -- things that come within the...

MR. GRAY:another exemption to the oil producers, is it?

MR. EVANS: No.

MR. PAULLEY: In other words, I gather, Mr. Speaker, on this Bill, that the authority of the Lieutenant-Governor in Council must still be obtained in respect of the ten miles

MR. EVANS: From ten miles to five miles, the Lieutenant-Governor in Council; below five miles.....

MR. PAULLEY: Yes, below five miles will be the Minister, whereas at the present time from ten miles all the way down is the Lieutenant-Governor in Council.

MR. SPEAKER: Are you ready for the question?

MR. CAMPBELL: Mr. Speaker, I have no objection to changing from the Lieutenant-Governor in Council to the Minister. I think that in practice it means pretty nearly the same thing. But personally, I always like to see the Lieutenant-Governor in Council in a statute rather than the Minister, for the simple reason that it indicates to some people, at least, that there's a beaocracy if just the Minister is allowed to do it, in so many things, and in practice, as the honourable members of the Cabinet know, it doesn't take very long to put through an Order-in-Council of this kind. And I think there is some advantage in having the other members of Council informed on just what is being done. Now so far as the change from ten miles down to five miles, I have no objection in the world to that. My objection to the Minister doing it is not of any great consequence because I think that the jurisdiction will be properly exercised, but I think that in our statutes generally that it looks better to the public if we vest these authorities in the Lieutenant-Governor in Council, rather than the Minister. Quite frankly as I have been -- different statutes have come up for reconsideration I tried all the time I was in the position of First Minister to recommend to my colleagues that they made the change to the Lieutenant-Governor in Council. If it's a matter that's as simple as this one, it doesn't take many minutes, and it's just that I think the procedure is a little less bureaucratic to be made by Order-in-Council. However, I'm not going to press it -- shall we say to the extent of a vote -- and I have no serious objection but I would suggest it for consideration by the Minister and we might discuss it further in the committee stage.

MR. GRAY: Mr. Speaker, I support the suggestion made by the last speaker. I have no objection of leaving everything to the present Minister because I know he's very honest and just, but I read in the press that there were some changes of the portfolios, and probably I wouldn't like to leave the discretion to the other ministers.

MR. EVANS: I have no present knowledge of anything of that sort, so I'm acting under present circumstances.

After a voice vote, Mr. Speaker declared the motion carried.

MR. SPEAKER: Committee of Supply.

MR. ROBLIN: I would like to move seconded by the Honourable the Minister of Mines and Natural Resources, that Mr. Speaker do now leave the chair and the House resolve itself into a committee to consider of the supply to be granted to Her Majesty.

Mr. Speaker read the motion and after a voice vote declared the motion carried.

The Honourable Member for St. Matthews took the chair.

MR. CHAIRMAN: Mine and Fisheries -- Natural Resources. Item 10, Fisheries.

MR. PAULLEY: Mr. Chairman, just before we proceed with the business of the committee, I'd like to raise the question of the comfort of the members of the committee. We have met this last few days in Law Amendments, and I presume the same custom will now prevail in respect of other committees of the House, and I am raising the question as to whether or not it would not be permissible for the members of this committee if they so felt at ease, to divest themselves of their jackets during the sitting of this committee. Now we all realize, of course, Sir, that we're meeting under rather unusual circumstances in the middle of the summer. There may be some provisions -- I do not know -- in customs and usages insofar as the House itself is concerned which controls us when Mr. Speaker is in his chair. We know that in this particular committee we're permitted to smoke and relax, and it appears as though I can speak from the Honourable the First Minister's chair and he from mine, and the likes -- and I'm just wondering whether or not, Mr. Chairman, there would be anything to debar any member of the committee if he saw fit to take off his jacket. Now at the present time, of course, my tie is quite relaxed. I think usually when Mr. Speaker's in the chair I do button it up a little bit - but, I just raise the question as to the comfort. And I think it might expedite business a little bit too.

MR. ROBLIN: Mr. Chairman, of course the committee and the House are the master of their own rules. Therefore, it is perfectly possible to adopt any rule regarding dress. I think that the honourable member has probably made a good case on a basis of need (Laughter) that we should take off our jackets in committee, and I personally have no objection to it. I do think, however, that we should not permit the same relaxation when Mr. Speaker is in the chair. Perhaps there are more experienced parliamentarians here who might like to comment on the matter, but it would seem to be all right for me to do that. I must in candour say that it is the Minister of Health who suggested to me that need might be a good basis on which this could be considered. (Laughter)

MR. MILLER: Mr. Chairman, I heartily concur in the suggestions made by the Honourable the Leader of the CCF Party. I am very glad indeed that the Leader of the House concurs. As a matter of fact, Mr. Chairman, members of the committee will probably recall that yesterday, when it was very, very sticky, I suggested to the Minister of Health that he prescribe for health reasons that members be permitted to take off their coats. I certainly welcome the suggestion that that be done because I am rather stout and probably feel the effects of the stickiness-the humidity -- more than some of my less well-favoured friends. I am heartily in support of that.

MR. HILLHOUSE: Mr. Speaker, applying the means' test, does that necessarily mean you have to have a clean shirt? (Laughter)

MR. ROBLIN: error, we don't operate on a mean's test -- it's a needs test. (Laughter).

MR. GROVES: I rise to the defense of those less privileged -- the matter of the Clerk and the staff of the House that have much heavier clothes on than we. Does it also include them?

MR. MILLER: I might say that I've perused the rules both of our House and the House at Ottawa, and I can find nothing to suggest that we are not permitted to do that even under the existing rules. I might say too, that in the Mother of Parliaments great latitude is permitted; they have their feet up on the table and everything else, and so forth and so on. And after all, I think we should take our cue from the Mother of Parliaments and permit the greatest latitude possible.

MR. CHAIRMAN:members to take off their coats and to put their feet on the table.

MR. GRAY: If we are to follow all recommendations for the members, might as well have an outlet here too.

MR. CHAIRMAN: in agreement on this question....

MR. CORBETT: I think you should insist that any of the gentlemen that only wear a false front -- what we used to call a dickey -- and then their underwear, that they've got to keep their coats on. (Laughter).

MR. CHAIRMAN: Let's be serious, for just a moment please before we come to a decision. I have heard this mentioned in several quarters and so on; I've just had one or two things -- thoughts -- come to my mind. I imagine when the committee rises and we say "Committee rise and call in the Speaker," I don't know just exactly where all the members are going to scramble to get their coats unless they have them down the backs of their chairs. But it seems as though -- one reason why I was hesitating in my own mind was that if it was going to give more flexibility to the oratorical muscles of the committee, that would be one argument against it, and I saw a movie theatre downtown there and it said, the picture was "Deep Heat", and underneath it said "Cool Inside". Well I thought that very well could have been put outside of our own Legislative Building here. But the other thought that I wondered was whether if -- we are fairly comfortable -- and if we made it more comfortable we might be sitting here until the snow flies. But if it's going to make us feel happy and if it's going to speed up business, and we are going to be generally comfortable, well I am all in favour of "Coats Off."

MR. PAULLEY: If we're cooler of body, we'll be cooler of temper too.

MR. MILLER: That was borne out today in Law Amendments Committee when we got through our business in an hour and a half.

MR. CHAIRMAN: Well now, we'll look for that, and see whether that's what it will be. (Interjection and Laughter)

MR. ROBLIN: Nobody from the CCF.

MR. CHAIRMAN: Well it's just "do as you please men' and.....

MR. PAULLEY: Please, Mr. Chairman,the circumstance does not arise again, I do assure my honourable friend.

MR. CHAIRMAN: I hope this spirit of unanimity will carry on all the way through the estimates.

MR. CAMPBELL: Mr. Chairman, I'd like to just make one suggestion though, and I make it in all sincerity and that is that if we are going to do this, I must confess that I look at the business outside of this chamber in a little different way to what I do inside the chamber even though it's in committee here, but if we're going to do this -- goodness knows I certainly don't want to register a note of opposition when so much unanimity prevails -- but if we're going to do it let's do it in the most regular way possible, and let somebody move that it be done and then let's have a vote on it because -- rather than leaving it -- let's make it as a decision. And for goodness sakes, if we do, then can we not extend, as the Honourable Member for St. Vital has suggested, can we not extend the courtesy to the Clerk of the House so that at least he can divest himself of the gown, because I have found from limited experience that those particular ceremonial garbs are very warm, and certainly the page boys and the assistant Sargeant-at-Arms -- I don't know -- I've been looking over the uniform of the Sergeant-at-Arms -- I don't know that his uniform lends itself to much divestment but couldn't we have it extended as far as possible, if we're going to do it.

MR. PAULLEY: Mr. Chairman, I don't know whether or not the Clerk -- a very good friend of mine -- comes under the jurisdiction of the committee or the government itself. So therefore -- I think he does come under the Speaker -- but in order that this be -- a suggestion be, as suggested by the Leader of the Opposition by motion, I make a motion, Mr. Chairman, that members of the committee be permitted to remove their jackets if they feel inclined to do so.

MR. MILLER: Mr. Chairman,rules, I'll second that.

Mr. Chairman called for a voice vote and declared the motion carried.

MR. CHAIRMAN: Return to Fisheries Branch.

MR. EVANS: Mr. Chairman, if you'll pardon me just a moment. Mr. Chairman, in the first place I would like to express my appreciation for one, to the Leader of the CCF for the suggestion, and I hope it will make us all feel more comfortable and I am sure it will.

I would like at the outset, if it is agreeable to you, Sir, and if it suits the convenience of the committee, to answer questions which were put to me last night that I was not able to

(Mr. Evans, Cont'd.) answer, as well as I've been able to get the information together. I believe the Honourable Member for St. George asked me about abolishing the early stubble shoot, and unfortunately the honourable member isn't in his seat but perhaps he'll see it in Hansard later on. The regulations for the seasons and so forth to do with waterfowl are passed by Ottawa's Order-in-Council, and so we cannot make the final statement as to what the regulations will be. Nevertheless, the early season on cultivated land was not this year requested. That is as far as we're concerned, we did not request that there be an early stubble shooting season. There was a very mixed reception with regard to the early stubble shoot from the farmers themselves. It applied to cultivated land and therefore included stubble. And as I understand it, and it seemed logical to me, it's desirable to have birds settle in stubble and stay there if possible, so as not to move on to standing crops and damage them. So in all the circumstances including that reason, I would tell the honourable member that we have decided not to recommend a stubble shoot this year.

The Leader of the Opposition asked who represented the Department at the St. Louis-Missouri meeting and requested a digest of the report that he made at that time. The Department was represented by Mr. G. W. Malaher, the Director of Game, and a digest of his remarks at the meeting is here and I'm glad to provide this copy to the Honourable the Leader of the Opposition.

As a result of the representation made, a co-operative survey of the waterfowl depredation problem was commenced on the prairies last year with United States federal and some state officials working with Canadian Wildlife Service and provincial representatives. The initial survey was of an exploratory nature and is this year considerably enlarged with teams working in each of the prairie provinces on the over-all problem and determining ways and means of solution.

The Leader of the Opposition and the Honourable Member of St. George both asked for the season and bag limits of previous years, and I have them here and if it suits your convenience I'll read them into Hansard and you'll have the record of them.

During the period 1952 to 1958 the ducks were in good supply. Limits were increased in 1953 and remained unchanged through 1958. Season limits were removed in that year as not being enforceable. There are three sets of limits in the year 1952. There was the daily; the number in possession at any one time; and then the season limit; and it was found impossible to trace back how many a given hunter might have shot in a particular season. The season dates given below are those for the general season in southern Manitoba. At The Pas seasons commence a week earlier and on the Delta marsh about one week later. The closing date of the season is normally not significant but is set late enough to provide hunting until normal freeze up date. Then the year 1952 the season opening in southern Manitoba from September 19th to November 15th: The daily limit 8; in possession 16; the season 40. Then in 1953 September 18th to November 14th: 10 for a daily bag and in possession 30. In 1954 September 24th to November 27th with the same limits as the year before. 1955, September 23rd to November 30th; 1956, September 21st to December 1st; 1957, September 20th to November 30th; and 1958, September 19th to November 29th. All the years with the exception of 1952 have same daily and in possession limits.

Questions were asked concerning the quantity of ducks, prairie chicken and partridge-- what might be called the population -- and I have notes to that effect although they're not worked out in figures. It is correct that water areas on the prairies are less in number this year, that is the water areas are less in number this year. This condition is not as bad in Manitoba as it is further west. Shortage of water where nesting normally occurs has led to redistribution of waterfowl and disturbance of nesting activity. Return of birds to Manitoba this spring was up to normal; more than normal in the north; and slightly less than normal in the south because of the smaller amount of water. The increase in the north is believed to be at the expense of the western or dry areas in the prairies. Upland game bird in abundance. Sharp tailed grouse, known as prairie chicken, rough grouse or bush partridge and Hungarian partridge are all on the up swing in their abundant cycle. Winter and spring reports show sharp tails in very good supply. Rough grouse are also in good supply. Hungarian partridge show a good increase last year -- showed a good increase last year -- and further increase anticipated this year. The peak of the cycle is expected in a year or two from now.

(Mr. Evans, Cont'd.) The Honourable Member for Ste. Rose asked about the cause of the decline in the numbers of the canvasback. The general picture of the canvasback numbers is obtained in the annual summer surveys in Canada and in the wintering ground surveys in the United States. Decrease in numbers is a recognized fact. Special studies are being conducted by the United States Fish and Wild Life Service and by Delta Waterfowl Research Station. Studies are incomplete to date, but indicate that the drought of the last two years is the main reason. Canvasback are highly specific in their nesting requirements. Prairie potholes are their main nesting areas and they are the first birds to be affected by adverse water conditions.

The Honourable Member for Ste. Rose also asked concerning experiments in Manitoba in trying to introduce wild turkeys. Sixteen wild turkeys were last year purchased and released by a group of Game and Fish Associations in southern Manitoba. Game Branch biologists assisted the association in determining the best areas for release. We are not too hopeful of the successful introduction of wild turkeys as Manitoba does not have the same type of habitat in which they are normally found and our winters are likely to prove severe. The branch will again co-operate with these associations if further birds are brought in this year. The same question was asked concerning pinnated grouse. This species is not a true native of Manitoba. Its first occurrence was recorded some seventy years ago when it extended its range northward from the Dakotas. It has sadly decreased throughout its range due largely to the loss of habitat in changing land use. In Manitoba it flourished for a time but has not been numerous since the late 1930's and is now extremely scarce. With increasing scarcity, it has with sharp tails and in some degree -- has in some degree, and this may have contributed to its decline as a separate species here. Full reasons for the Manitoba decline are not known. Contributing factors may be the loss of habitat here as elsewhere, and Manitoba is not included in the original range. Extension of range occurred when birds were very abundant. Similar and renewed extension is not now likely. Special protection of this species is very difficult as hunters do not separate them from the sharp tailed grouse. They are not in the open list for hunting and appeals have been made to hunters to learn their identification and conserve their

The Leader of the Opposition asked about the disposal of muskrat pelts. The Netley-Fisher River and Whitewater were formerly operated as fur rehabilitation blocks, but they are now thrown open to general trapping. In the Delta of Lake Manitoba, now operated by individual groups -- as a community trapping area, rather than as a controlled block. In the Summer-berry still operated as a fur rehabilitation block, operated under controlled trapping, there are individual limits; the trapper is allotted to a zone; all pelts are turned in to the governments; they are graded and sold by public auction. 75% is sold in Winnipeg at the Dominion Fur and Soudack Auctions; 25% are sold in Montreal and at the Hudson's Bay Company Auction, largely to obtain a controlled price to see that our prices are as good as those that could be obtained elsewhere. Ordinarily there's very little variation in price. This year the Winnipeg price was slightly higher. The average price this year was \$1.11; the average price last year 65¢. Each trapper's account is credited with the number of rats caught by him, multiplied by the average price. This money is placed to the credit of his account and it is dispersed to him in monthly installments of \$25.00.

The Honourable Member for Fisher, I believe it was, asked about the elk population at Birch River and the Mantago River area. There is no recent specific information on this small elk herd. It was not located in the aerial surveys of last spring. The animals are known to range quite widely. It is believed their numbers have decreased rather than increased.

The Honourable Member for St. George asked about deer in the interlake. In recognition of deer losses during the bad winter of 1956-57 a 'buck only' season was declared in the interlake area for the 1957 winter season. Hunters' success was unexpectedly good, being 67.5% or very nearly the provincial average of 68.3. A normal season was in effect in 1958, with a limit of one deer, either sex. Hunters' success was 74.7 which was above the provincial average of 65.4. Aerial censusing of deer was this spring extended to parts of the interlake area. This survey and other reports indicate a quite satisfactory comeback of the deer in the interlake area.

The Leader of the Opposition asked the following question concerning the price at which land in the Pasquia area would be sold. As I gathered it, at what price it would have to

(Mr. Evans, Cont'd.) be sold to return the investment and if it is still the policy to try to recover that investment. I think it becomes necessary to deal with the actual division of the acreages with the Pasquia because different price conditions prevail on different blocks and I will run through this. The total acreage is 120,000 acres; patented land, Indian reserves and storage basin 20,000, leaving a remainder of 100,000. Lands under crop share lease and permit as at the date of the agreement and are allocated solely to the province in the amount of 35,000 acres. At the time the Pasquia arrangement was made, there was 35,000 acres of patented land and Manitoba was given the sole disposition of that land, so that is taken out of the total leaving a remainder of 65,000. The sale price of the remaining 65,000 acres is allocated in the proportion of the Dominion receiving 75%, the province 25%. The agreement sets a limit of \$30.00 per acre. Certain parcels will be valued at approximately this amount, others lower, according to the actual value. The policy will be to recover the investment, subject however to a fair price to the settler to enable him to carry on an economic operation. The project will be fully completed in the fall of 1960. When completed the expenditures of the province will be approximately \$650,000.00, and the anticipated recovery is that the province should recover at least 100% of the investment, and there is every likelihood that they will recover more.

The Honourable Member for Brokenhead asked me concerning the taxes, the municipal taxes which might be collected in connection with hay leases and hay permits, and I'm afraid that I gave him an answer which was partially incorrect. I said that the amount of the tax was collected in the provincial fees and then remitted to the municipality. That is the case where a permit is involved, a one year permit, and the one-third of the total collected is remitted to the municipality in lieu of taxes. However in the case of a hay lease, which is much longer and they run as long as ten years, the situation is different. Each municipality has its own varying mill rate which it levies, and on request by a municipality it is quite within the power of the department to cancel a hay lease in the event that municipal taxes are not paid. The initiative in that regard must arise with the municipality but the power exists to cancel the lease if necessary.

The Honourable Member for Ste. Rose asked concerning the Sleeve Lake community pasture and I had another discussion with my honourable friend, the Minister of Agriculture and I think it might be convenient if he dealt with this point. The Minister prefers to deal with this point on his estimates as I find that it is a community pasture in that sense, and he will deal with that point when he comes to it if that's acceptable to the committee.

MR. CAMPBELL: What department is it under?

MR. EVANS: My information is that it comes under the Department of -- it's the Department of Agriculture. I had a reference here to the vote number, but my colleague will deal with that when he comes to it, if that's agreeable. In dealing with the question in our short discussion about the question of owning summer homesites, the Leader of the Opposition asked me if I would table the regulations in this regard, and I find that perhaps it would not have served the purpose to table what I had, which was a copy of the regulations of the forestry branch, but I have the references here and will just describe them briefly if that would be suitable to the honourable member. There is a distinction here which my good friend the Leader of the CCF Party pointed out to me 'sotto voce', or loud enough for me to hear anyway. When we were discussing the division of the work between the Lands Branch and the Forest Branch I did not have clearly in mind that any recreational development in the forest reserves come under the Forest Branch, and elsewhere on Crown land come under the Lands Branch. For a time, the Lands Branch issued ten-year leases with provision for one renewal period of ten years; but now leases in both the Lands Branch and the Forest Service are for 21 years, with provision for one renewal period also of 21 years. The Crown Lands Act, section 91 A, gives power to grant leases not exceeding 21 years. The Forest Act regulations, Section 82, provide for leases of 21 years with a further renewal offered to the tenant at that time of 21 years. The practice in both branches at the present time -- and I understand certainly in the recent past -- has been to give maximum leases to all cottage owners on their properties. There is no provision in both branches that the rents may be revised or reviewed every five years, and of course that is either up or down. I hope those are all the questions that were outstanding -- those are all that I had notes of.

MR. GRAY: Mr. Chairman. . . . ask a question. I may be too late -- the item was

(Mr. Gray, cont'd.) passed -- but the Minister has only reported it tonight. What is being done to encourage, or get settlers on Crown lands?

MR. EVANS: I should think the answer to that question, Mr. Chairman, would be this, that we have no concerted sales drive, as it were, to try to sell these parcels of Crown lands. Are you speaking of, for example, agricultural land?

MR. GRAY: Crown lands available for settlement.

MR. EVANS: Well the way they are disposed of normally is to advertise them and receive any offers that come in. I'm not aware of any special efforts being made to secure new settlers for these Crown lands.

MR. GRAY: A supplementary question. Are those immigrants or settlers that come in here, are they aware that there is Crown land available for settlement?

MR. EVANS: I can say this, Mr. Chairman, that if any of them were to inquire of the government they would be fully informed. I am not able to say whether they are aware of it when they come to the province or not.

MR. GUTTORMSON: Mr. Chairman, last night I inquired about the Hungarian partridge. Was the Minister unable to get any details on it?

MR. EVANS: Would it suit your convenience to read Hansard on that? I did answer the question, perhaps before you were able

MR. GUTTORMSON: I was here; I didn't hear you specify the Hungarian partridge. You mentioned the bush partridge but not the Hungarian partridge. (Interjection). If you did, then I'll read Hansard. I didn't catch it; I was here though.

MR. EVANS: Just check it over and see: "The Hungarian partridge showed a good increase last year and a further increase is anticipated this year."

MR. CAMPBELL: Mr. Chairman, I don't wish to revive the discussion on these matters at all, but I would like to make a request of the Minister with regard to his statement that his department had not asked the Federal Government to make provision in their regulations this year for, what is called, an early stubble shoot. Well, one problem there is that if these duck depredations start early in the year -- and they vary according to the kind of harvest weather that there is -- of course I guess the same kind of weather is responsible for the ducks coming down at a particular time to this area, and while it's true that the department is usually quite willing to grant permits to these farmers to 'shoot to scare' on their own land, the difficulty is that if the weather is fit for harvesting, the farmer himself -- that's his busiest season of the year, and he just hasn't the time or opportunity to do any shooting. So it is necessary, in my opinion, on those occasions to make provision for other people rather than the farmer himself, to be invited on -- and they're usually very glad to go -- and I just urge the Minister to keep that in mind, because while the department is quite appreciative of the problem so far as the farmer is concerned, the farmer just hasn't the time, if the weather is good, to do any of that work. However, rather than me making representations on it, if I could get the Minister to undertake, as I'm sure he will, that when this group of people come in to discuss with him and his officials the duck feeding program this year, that he develop that situation with them. I am sure that he will find that those people during the couple of years that they've been working intensively at that program have become the real experts, so far as our community is concerned, on that problem. And I'd be prepared to take their recommendation with regard to it. And might I make the further request, Mr. Chairman, that the -- and I appreciate the fact that he has given me a digest of the presentation that Mr. Malaher made at the St. Louis meeting -- if he would see that that is discussed also at the same time. I haven't had the opportunity to read it yet. I think that would be very useful to the delegation as well. They are doing a good work out there and I think they're exceptionally well informed on it and they're the ones that could make, what I believe to be the proper representation .

MR. EVANS: You are right, Sir, and I'm very glad to have had this further discussion. We are preparing a broad agenda -- not simply the one question of duck feeding; we are going to discuss it as broadly as possible. I'll undertake to raise those points.

MR. CHAIRMAN: Game and Fisheries Branch. I think the Minister . . .

MR. EVANS: Mr. Chairman, I would like to take this opportunity to make a broad statement concerning the commercial fishing industry, and I would welcome as full a discussion as we can have. There is nothing that we have undertaken in the department which has taken

(Mr. Evans, Cont'd.)..... more time, both on the part of the staff and certainly of mine, than the commercial fishing industry. Those who are members of the special select committee of the legislature -- and I see one or two present now -- will know the complexities of the commercial fishing business. It's as complex as it can be in many ways. There are the biological aspects of restoring the right sizes and kinds and species of fish in the lakes. Then there are very many human aspects of it. The fishing industry is divided into sections, or divisions. There are the fishermen; there are the packers; there are the fish companies who export and there are, of course, the officials of the department with the regulations to enforce. And over the years the lake - particularly Lake Winnipeg - has declined very seriously, in the quality and quantity of fish that apparently are there to be taken, and relations between the various sections of the industry have not been good. I think it is not too much to say that there is possibly distrust, or suspicion, existing between the different sections of the fishing industry. We believe that all of these things can be tackled on a broad basis, and if there is one major program that's been launched in the Department of Mines and Natural Resources in the last twelve months, it has been to make a start -- and I can claim no more than to make a start -- on an improvement in the conditions of the commercial fishing industry in Manitoba. When we took office there was no adequate research in progress; there was some data accumulated but not nearly enough, on which to base any scientific conclusions. Now, I firmly believe that no permanent cure of the lake in any of its aspects will be effected until we are able to get a scientific basis underneath it to determine whether in fact the measures that are being recommended -- the net sizes, the seasons and all the other factors - are well designed, on a basis of the findings of the biological research, to maintain and improve the quantity and quality of fish in the water.

But I found that conditions on Lake Winnipeg were such that it was necessary to make a start at once. It was the general opinion of the fishermen -- and I rely on their opinion a great deal -- it was the general opinion of the fishermen that the fishing pressure had been so heavy for various reasons, that Lake Winnipeg had declined to a point where any further fishing of it would have brought it to a point where it would no longer have been worthwhile, at least in certain sections, to engage in the commercial fishing operation on that lake. And so I have prepared some notes here of the -- summarizing the situation as I found it, the early steps, and they are only the early steps; that we have initiated, and if it is agreeable to the committee, Mr. Chairman, I will follow my notes closely and lay before the committee as briefly as I can a statement now concerning the fishing industry.

Incidentally it was a revelation to me as to what an extensive and valuable industry it is. It is one of the most valuable fresh water fisheries certainly on this continent and possibly one of the most valuable fresh water fisheries in the world. The water area of the Province of Manitoba is some 39,000 square miles and of this area about 22,000 square miles of lakes and rivers are fished commercially. These waters have given Manitoba one of the largest and most valuable fresh water fisheries in the world. Our annual production exceeds 39,000,000 with a value at the market of some \$6,000,000.00 a year. The main species are whitefish, pickerel and sauger and approximately 90% of the production goes to the United States. It seemed to me worthwhile to recite a few background facts because as we discuss this I would like to feel that we are examining it with as much information as possible before us. The main producers are Lakes Winnipeg, Manitoba, Winnipegosis, and Dauphin in the south, and South Indian, Gods, and the Manitoba portion of the Reindeer in northern Manitoba. In addition, we now have more than 90 small lakes and rivers contributing to the over-all production -- a very large number of lakes indeed. Since the transfer of resources to Manitoba including the commercial fisheries, on July 15th of 1930, the fisheries of the province has been the subject of investigation by two bodies and the first was the Grant Commission of 1933/34 and there was the committee of the Legislature in 1953/54. The report of the Grant Commission dealt mainly with the marketing situation and the legislative committee made some 40 recommendations. The large number of these recommendations of the legislative committee were put into effect. I suggest however, that recommendation number 8 was perhaps the most important but appears to have received the least attention since the time of the report. I would like to read recommendation number 8: "That the government increase the biological research staff for the province to be of a size comparable to the needs of the fishing industry and to its position as the leading fresh water fish producer in Canada. That such biological work should include the following: to determine the

(Mr. Evans, Cont'd.)..... effect of mesh size on fish population; to determine the value of other means of catching fish; to determine the effect of means of making natural spawning grounds accessible to fish; to determine the effect of the volume of fish food on the fish population; to investigate the natural spawning grounds in appropriate rivers and lakes to ascertain the optimum water level for fish propagation; to establish close liaison between the Department of Mines and Natural Resources and the Central Fisheries Research Station so that there may be no duplication of effort and so that the findings may be shared; to investigate the sturgeon grounds in Manitoba with the view to recommending commercial sturgeon fishing where possible without depleting the species; to investigate the effects of dumping fish and fish offal into fishing waters."

Those seem to me to be the bedrock on which any scientific measures to improve the fishing operations and the quantity and quality of fish in the water. In my opinion all too little was done -- very little was done, between the time of that report and about a year ago. We were fortunate in obtaining the services of Dr. Ken Doan to head up our research program. Within a matter of weeks of his appointment, and working on some material which was already available but never made use of, he was able by scale readings to predict a large catch of whitefish this year and perhaps a peak in 1960. We feel that with increased research there is a distinct possibility that within a few years time we can predict in advance with reasonable accuracy what the catch will be. The importance of that is this, that on my trips through the lakes I heard so often that "Oh, leave the fish alone and they'll come back naturally -- there is a cycle in fish." Well, that is perfectly true except that we have been able to place these scale readings back now and the catches for several years back there is a periodicity, but the peak is gradually getting lower and lower and lower and whereas the maximum catch now of whitefish on Lake Winnipeg may reach 2,000,000 pounds it was quite common, I believe many years ago, a number of years ago, that a peak of some 3,000,000 would be reached. And so there was a steady decline in graphs which I have seen, of the peak at the tops of these various periods indicating a slow but sure decline although at various periods there would appear to be an upturn which was a false encouragement at that time.

The Fisheries Branch now has four biologists on the permanent staff and two additional biologists will shortly be employed. Dr. Ken Doan is in charge of Lake Winnipeg, Mr. Burt Kooyman in charge of general biological work and Mr. Lief Sunde is doing general biological work in northern Manitoba. Mr. Alexander Fedoruk is working on creel census in the Whiteshell and one of the two biologists shortly to come on the staff will be engaged on pollution problems. I would like to mention the qualifications of Dr. Doan who is heading up our biological research staff. He was permanently appointed to our staff on March 16th of this year. In 1937, he obtained his BA at the University of Toronto with honours in biology; in 1938 his MA at the University of Toronto; his thesis being "Studies of the Smallmouth Bass in Ontario;" in 1941 he obtained his Ph.D. at Ohio State University. From 1938 to 1941 he was research assistant in fisheries -- both commercial and smallmouth bass; in 1942 to 1944 research associate and lecturer in ichthyology and fish management at biological stations on Lake Erie under the Ohio State University; in 1944 to 1952 he was acting director of Central Fisheries Research Station, Winnipeg, under the Fisheries Research Board of Canada. So we are acquiring a substantial staff under the heading of one of the leading fish experts, certainly of Canada and one of the leaders on the North American continent. Immediately upon taking office it was impressed on me that the fisheries particularly in Lake Winnipeg were in need of urgent and immediate action. To obtain first hand information, I visited and had meetings with a large number of commercial fishermen. Needless to say, many solutions were put forward but there was general opinion on the following points, that the size of mesh should be rigidly enforced; that there was need for more research by competent biologists and these are the opinions not of academic men but of the fishermen themselves; and that on certain lakes reduction in the fishing efforts by the elimination of at least one season. So far as the size of mesh is concerned we warned all fishermen by individual letters, prior to the opening of the season that the regulations would be enforced and for that purpose we have employed additional patrols and an additional road patrol to inspect and check stations and plants located on the mainland. One of these letters was addressed to each fisherman who had a license and fair warning was issued to all of them that the regulations would be enforced and enforced strictly.

Last summer there was a large production of small whitefish in the north end of the

(Mr. Evans, Cont'd.) lake. While the price for medium and large whitefish was about 25¢, the fish grading small, brought anywhere from 5¢ a pound to not more than 11¢ or 12¢ at the very top. The best evidence I can give you that the enforcement is producing results is in connection with the inspection of a shipment of whitefish comprising 239 boxes which the Director himself made on Monday, July 6th. Of the 239 boxes, 7 graded small, 231 graded medium and large, and one box graded jumbo. It had been mentioned to me at more points than one that the jumbo whitefish was disappearing, that we would no longer see the jumbo. Well, in this particular shipment, it was a delight to see jumbo whitefish again appearing out of Lake Winnipeg.

In connection with the 7 boxes of smalls, it was interesting to me to see the nets themselves when they were pulled in. small fish actually caught in large mesh by having the gills entangled in the cords or the strings, or whatever they are called or being caught by the teeth or caught around the angle of the jaw. So the small number of 7 out of 239 boxes was regarded as very satisfactory indeed. The preponderance of medium and large indicates clearly that legal mesh is being used. I suggest that the much higher price for the larger fish will very quickly bring home to the fishermen the advantage of following the regulations themselves.

Now let me say this, that this result we do not claim to be by any means solely the result of the enforcement that has been put on the lake this year. I believe the co-operation of the fishermen has been enlisted in their own self-interest in the enforcement and observance of the mesh size regulations on Lake Winnipeg. I believe that that co-operation on the part of the fishermen can be nurtured -- I believe that it can be improved. It's being freely offered and the attitude of the fishermen themselves is most encouraging and I would like to pay tribute to them at this time. They are under difficulties. It is a difficult profession to begin with. They have been under difficulties and facing what they thought was a declining future. They had not been organized, and I will come to that point in a few minutes. They had not been joined together in any organization but they are coming together now in larger numbers to form a fishermen's federation which I believe will, as time goes on, and these things will take time, but as time goes on I believe they will be able to and they certainly want to undertake more and more of what might be called self-regulation or self-discipline in this regard. Nevertheless, I do point out that the increased enforcement has been a factor as well.

The north end where the whitefish operations are being carried on comprises approximately two-thirds of the area of the lake or approximately 6,000 square miles. Obviously it's impossible to fully police so large an area but we are making as good an effort as we can in that direction and we believe that the co-operation of the fishermen working with us will enable these efforts to be successful or increasingly successful. I must not claim too much, or perhaps even very much as an accomplishment to date. The only thing that we have done is to begin on a plan which I am sure must be looked at in terms of 10, 15 or 20 years for the complete rehabilitation of the lake or for the very large improvement that we hope for. But as time goes on and the months go by I think we will see signs of progress. At almost every point I visited on Lake Winnipeg I heard reports concerning the small whitefish taken last year and particularly in Sturgeon Bay, in close proximity to the whitefish hatchery there. To prevent a recurrence, Sturgeon Bay was closed to summer fishing. But at this point I would like to say this, that we will at all times be studying and restudying the regulations that we make, asking our biologists to follow up to see what results accrue and will always be willing to reconsider any of the regulations once a year. We cannot vary the regulations in mid-season, we cannot vary the regulations after they have been established, but we are always ready to reconsider them. And there does appear to be this factor, that the whitefish may leave Sturgeon Bay in July and are replaced by pickerel. That will be studied by the biologists and if that turns out to be true that the small whitefish do leave Sturgeon Bay in the month of July, it may be possible to allow some fishing of pickerel in that area after the whitefish have left.

In the southeast end of Lake Winnipeg fishing with 5" mesh only, was permitted except at summer resort areas where smaller mesh is permitted to supply fish for the local summer residents. While the fish companies and others contended that the 5" mesh in the south end would be useless I am very glad to be able to say that the limited number of fishermen who took advantage of the season with 5" in the south, have secured very good quantities of sunfish and some rough fish which they have marketed profitably to mink breeders and some of it has been

(Mr. Evans, Cont'd.).....sold for consumption. Disposingat that point I believe a good deal can be done to market for human consumption a good deal of the fish that has been regarded as purely rough fish in the past or not entirely attractive for human consumption. Some of it, the silver bass, or the sheephead I believe is a delicacy, I believe that it's very popular with people of certain racial extractions and every effort will be made to find every outlet for what has been called the rough fish. In the channel area, this is the portion, the narrow portion of the lake extending roughly from MacBeth Point south to Hecla Island. In this area fishing was formerly allowed during the summer, fall and winter, that is three seasons. Three seasons in the narrow neck of Lake Winnipeg with only short periods intervening. At a meeting in March attended by the representatives of the fishermen's associations including delegates from Matheson Island and Rabbit point it was agreed that one season must be eliminated and the summer season in the channel area was discontinued. This meant that a large number of local settlers were left without their usual employment. To compensate them and other similarly affected we commenced widening and improving the Riverton-Matheson Island Road. At the present time over 100 are employed on that project and I am informed that they are satisfied with the arrangements made for them.

The whole question of marketing and of the quality of the fish must receive increasing attention. Our investigations to date indicate that there is a great need for additional cold storage facilities so far as fishery products are concerned. We have been in touch with a number of operators regarding the construction of further cold storage facilities but our efforts have not as yet produced concrete results. But our efforts in this connection will be continued. Fish is a very perishable product and must reach the ultimate consumer in first class shape. The industry in Manitoba and other western provinces is under certain handicaps in this connection, namely of course the distance from the place where the fish is caught to rail head or to serviceable roads, and the fact that production is marketed in the United States, in New York, in Chicago, in Detroit and Cleveland points up the distances that must be travelled. Much can be done to improve and maintain the quality of fish. We are constantly impressing upon fishermen the necessity to lift their nets at regular intervals, to see that the fish is properly iced as soon as it is removed from the nets, and this program is continuing to bear fruit.

As I stated a few moments ago a large percentage or over 90% of our fish is marketed in the United States. This is quite satisfactory as long as the market continues and continues at the satisfactory prices that are prevailing now and have prevailed in recent years, but it would be prudent, we believe to try to expand and vary this market as far as possible in other parts of Canada and if possible in other countries of the world. That will be kept constantly in view and marketing and merchandising plans prepared accordingly. During September, 1958, I visited a large number of fishing stations on Lake Winnipeg during the fall fishing operations. Places visited were Pine Dock, Matheson Island, Black Bear Island, Dog Head, Calder's Dock, Riverton, Hnausa, Arnes and Gimli. Fishermen from Hecla and Rabbit Point also took part in these particular discussions. Toward the end of September a fishermen's meeting was called at Winnipegosis which was well attended. In addition to the Winnipegosis fishermen, representatives attended from Camperville, Duck Bay and Overflowing River. On October 3rd a meeting of Lake Manitoba fishermen was held at Portage la Prairie. Fifty fishermen attended this meeting representing Delta, Portage la Prairie, St. Ambroise, Westbourne, Amaranth, Langruth, St. Laurent, Oak Point and The Narrows. Then on March 30th, 1959, a meeting of the Lake Winnipeg fishermen was held in the Marlborough Hotel. 60 fishermen attended. Special delegates were invited and a large number of areas were represented. The reference there is this, that we invited the members of the Fishermen's Federation where they had been established, or where they had established local associations, but there were large areas where no such federations existed and at those points we invited special delegates to attend to give the advice in connection with their areas. Unfortunately, due to ice conditions fishermen from the north end of the lake were unable to attend personally but were represented by members of the Indian Affairs Branch. At this point, I might say that the question that was dealt with by my honourable friend for St. George is also something I would like to refer to. We did not invite fishermen from Winnipegosis to come to this Lake Winnipeg fishermen's meeting-- perhaps it was ignorance on my part, I did not realize that in the winter time they travelled from their location over to Lake Winnipeg in order to take part in that winter fishing. It was an oversight, and as

(Mr. Evans, Cont'd.).....honourable members probably know I overtook that at a later stage, and had a special meeting with them. The formation of a federation resulted from the convention convened in Winnipeg of the 30th of March and the 31st. Forty voting delegates attended and elected a tentative executive. Areas represented by the delegates were Lake Winnipeg, Lake Manitoba, Lake Winnipegosis and the northern lakes. There is an approximate membership of 300 now in the various locals of the federation.

In connection with the federation, let me say that in the past there has been little or no co-operation among the fishermen themselves. The individual fishermen worked in their own way, often to their own disadvantage. Now an organization exists through which any fisherman can deal with problems affecting the industry. While the membership is small, it serves as a foundation for a larger and healthier association, and as the commercial fishermen become aware of the role which the association can and will play in the affairs of the industry, they will, I am confident, support the association in the work which it is carrying on. And I may say it will be an object of policy of the department to encourage the growth of the Fisherman's Federation and of the local associations. The aims and the objects of the federation are to maintain an organization, to assist, promote encourage and support the interest and welfare of the industry as a whole; to promote and improve harmony and the co-operation between the members of the association and the government departments; and generally to advance mutual interests of those engaged in the industry.

Mr. Chairman, I thought it might be useful for the members to have a summary, it might be called, of the activities that the department has engaged in, in the last year in the fishing industry to act as a background if you will, for any questions they may wish to ask.

MR. GRAY: Mr. Chairman, I hope no one in the House will accuse me of making a comment or two on this subject, charging me with not knowing anything about this subject. I admit -- I don't know, but after listening to the Honourable Minister I think perhaps I got a better idea. I agree with the Minister the value of the fish industry, and it is very encouraging that 90% are being exported. I feel however, that the people of this province should be able to have a valuable food at a reasonable price. At the present time it is almost prohibitive. First of all it is a very healthy food, and second as far as I'm concerned I do not need to question whether it is Kosher or not

But the price, when you go down to the retail stores, and I suppose you could ask your wives and they'll tell you that to buy fish for a meal would cost them about over \$2.00 and this is not buying too much. What I would like to know is this. In the report on page 67 it gives a summary of the production in the last 10 years. I'll take only the last year, and by the way I see a reduction from 1955 to 1957-58, but it says that the quality in pounds produced was over 31,000,000 pounds. The value to the fisherman was only \$3,270,000. I mean the value in production, but the value to the fisherman was only \$3,270,000 and the value as marketed is \$5,900,035, about \$3,000,000 is missing between the producer and the consumer. It would be interesting to know where the \$3,000,000 is being spent or disappeared. Would it be possible to see that the difference between the marketed value and what the producer gets -- the amount is far too much -- far too much. In other words a shortage of \$3,000,000 between what the producer gets and what the consumer pays. I cannot say where the money disappeared but I think that the people of the province are entitled to get a valuable food at a much lower cost in order to encourage them to consume a food which is healthy and a food which is produced in this province. I don't know the price that they are selling it when it is exported; perhaps the American people can afford to pay more, but I think that the price that the average family has to pay in the retail stores for fish is prohibitive and not many can afford to use it. So the question is, "Where did the \$3,000,000 disappear"? And a second question I would like to ask the Honourable Minister, is: Can he tell us the number of fishermen who get their existence or their subsistence solely from their industry, in other words how many fishermen are there in the province whose sole income is from their operations?

MR. EVANS: Mr. Chairman, on the system marketing, I must say that I have not been able to make much progress in that direction. We feel that our first objective was to tackle the biological factors to see if we can restore the quantities and quality of fish in that lake. We are beginning our studies of the marketing system and I hope when we meet again or possibly a year from now I might be able to give a more satisfactory answer about price spreads and matters of

(Mr. Evans, cont'd.) . . . that kind. Unfortunately I'm not able to say because I have no information on it.

With regard to the number of fishermen who earn their living solely from fishing I may not be able to secure that information because a great deal of the fish is taken by, in Lake Manitoba for example, by the people who largely farm and then fish in the winter. I think the same is true of all the lakes — that most of the fishermen will have other means of earning as well. So I doubt very much if I can obtain that figure.

. . . . continued on next page

MR. GUTTORMSON: Mr. Chairman, I listened with great interest to the outline of the fishing industry in Manitoba given by the Minister. I'm sorry he didn't give more details on the fishing industry in Lake Manitoba. He dealt with Lake Winnipeg rather fully. The plight of the fishermen in Lake Manitoba is very serious. The Minister will recall that at the last session I discussed the Lake Manitoba fishermen and the last winter they had a very bad winter. The price is excellent but the catch is very very poor. The biggest percentage of all fish caught in Lake Manitoba last winter was rough fish, but the biggest percentage being mullets or commonly know as sucker. And the fisherman received only 1¢ a pound for the mullets and other prices varying up to 5¢ for some of the other species of rough fish. The Minister will recall that I urged him to give some consideration to constructing a Fish Processing Plant in the interlake area in order that the fishermen could fish rough fish on a profitable basis. At the present day prices of rough fish they just can't make a go of it. Last winter a big percentage of the fishermen on Lake Manitoba just had to pull out their nets as early as the beginning of January because they were going so far into the hole. They tell me that they can make a living fishing rough fish if they can receive approximately 4¢ a pound. Unfortunately I don't know what the answer is to the problem on Lake Manitoba because if you stop fishing -- just let the Lake lay idle for a few years -- the rough fish, they will just increase that much more. Therefore the fishermen feel and I think there's some merit to their argument that something should be done to try to get rid of the rough fish and the only means we can do it is to fish the lake and make it profitable for the fishermen to do it.

Price of pickerel last, as I said before, was excellent. They were getting as high as 40¢ a pound for it, but unfortunately they would lift their nets and maybe get a matter of a few pounds from each lift, and this certainly doesn't pay wages of men working on the lake, and as you know the nets and equipment used by the fishermen is extremely high. I understand in previous years the idea of a Fish Processing Plant has been considered by private enterprise and it isn't a profitable business; but I felt that if the government went into this business they could probably break even and accomplish something by getting rid of the rough fish in the lake because as the situation stands today the fishermen are just going to have to abandon the lake and the condition is just going to get worse. This spring I was at one of the creeks in the Silver Bay Area and watched the men taking mullets from the creek and I saw them get as much as 4,000 pounds to a lift. They were selling this to some of the fish companies here and I think they were just getting, if my memory serves me correctly, roughly 1 1/2 to 2 ¢ a pound depending whether it was round or headless. I don't know if the Minister has given any consideration to this plant but I think it certainly would be worth considering in view of the serious plight of the fishermen today.

Another thing that's been giving considerable concern is the fact of Lake Winnipeg fishermen are coming over. I know the Minister said he would look into this when we attended that meeting at Portage la Prairie last year but despite the department's interest in this matter a large number are still coming over, although some of them left earlier than usual in view of the fact that the fishing was so poor last year and they were paying high wages. I know of one or two instances where a man was paid \$300 a month just to purchase a commercial operators license in order that an outside fisherman could come in and work the lake. At the fall session last year I, through an Order for Return, I obtained the names of all the fishermen with licenses on Lake Manitoba and made several checks all along the lake and at least two or three dozen instances the fisherman who gave addresses in towns along Lake Manitoba were not even known by the Postmaster or the merchants in the area.

The Minister mentions fisherman's organization. I think this is an excellent idea and I would encourage him to do everything in his power to expand this organization and give the man, I think his name is Helgi T. . . the organizer all the help he can because this is the only way that the fisherman is going to have a united organization and one that can accomplish something. It's quite true as the Minister said earlier the fishermen haven't been organized in the past and their ideas have not been jelled into one, and they have in too many instances, been working against one another.

Another thing I would like to see the Minister do, and it may be difficult to do, is to encourage in some ways the use of rough fish for commercial purposes such -- take northern pike, there isn't a thing wrong with it. It's quite true it's not as nice as pickerel, has more bones in it but it's certainly an edible fish, and we hear a lot about people finding it tough today with the

(Mr. Guttormson, cont'd.) . . . high cost of living, the poor families. The member for Inkster mentioned it. The northern pike could easily be sold for 15 and 20¢ -- this is just a hypothetical figure -- at the same time the fisherman could make a profitable living taking this fish from the lake. At the present time they may be getting 2 and 3¢ a pound for it and they just can't fish that species and make a living on it.

In closing I just wonder if the Minister would tell me what prompted his department to closing the lake to winter whitefishing between Reindeer Island and Long Point? Was it an error when the order was first issued or was it the fact that they changed their mind about it? Because it certainly caused a great deal of alarm in the area concerned because all the fishermen are certainly in favour of conservation, but when the order came out that fishermen to the south were allowed to take out 2,000,000 pounds in the summer months in this particular area, and the winter fishermen were unable to take out 250,000 pounds in the winter time, they couldn't see much from the point of conservation. And in addition to that even if the limit is 2,000,000 pounds more than that is likely to be taken because there's a great deal of spoilage in the summer months, while in the winter months there is no spoilage and everything taken from the lake is used.

MR. EVANS: Would it be convenient if I dealt with one point at a time? I would like to deal with the points, and the very good points that the Honourable Member for St. George has raised. With regard to fish processing of the rough fish, rendering them into fish meal and recovering the oils and that sort of thing, this is a very real project and we have been working very closely with one private enterpriser who wants to go into that business. One of the difficulties in that has been the cost of transporting the rough fish to the processing plant which would take up such a very large part of any value that the fish might have. And so his plans are, and I believe he is still proceeding with them although he has not announced his intention to go ahead, is to put a processing plant on a barge and take the barge to the fish, and render down the fish then on the barge and ship the product when he comes back to port. That's a new departure -- it holds promise of development. We're working closely with it, not only in the Department of Mines and Natural Resources, but the Department of Industry and Commerce as well, having to do then in that case with the marketing of it and helping in his studies of financial arrangements and capitalization and so on. So that project is alive - we are making progress with it and I do hope that means will be found to establish a rough fish processing plant as recommended by the member.

With regard to Lake Winnipeg fishermen fishing on Lake Manitoba, it's the intention of the Department to restrict the fish operators licenses to genuine Lake Manitoba fishermen. We do not attempt to, and I think it would be wrong, to tell those operators whom they might hire as fishermen. They can obtain licenses for any of their employees to work for them as fishermen but this matter is really in the control of the Lake Manitoba fishermen themselves. If they will restrict the -- let me put it the other way -- that we will issue these licenses in the first place to genuine residents of Lake Manitoba with the exception of a small number, which fishermen have, or operators have come from the Lake Winnipeg area for many years past, and it was decided last year, not to deprive them of a customary way of earning their living, but the number is small. The honourable member will have recognized those names on the list with which he was furnished at the last session. If there has been any such action as he describes under which one of the Lake Manitoba fishermen themselves have sold their operators license then that much blame surely must attach to a Lake Manitoba fisherman for allowing an operator from the outside to come in and use his license under what might be called, false pretenses. We have said we will do our best to try to restrict the operators licenses to genuine Lake Manitoba fishermen - that policy still holds and we'll try and work on it to see that it's carried out.

With regard to rough fish for food, I couldn't agree more. I think the pike is a good commercial food. I saw pike being processed and frozen at the Armstrong-Gimli plant when I was in Gimli. The extent of their market I do not know, but it was being filleted and frozen in the small packets and I didn't enquire at that time, the extent of their market. I believe it's a growing market; I believe it can be encouraged; it's a lower price and a thoroughly good palatable food, and anything the Department can do when we come to the marketing and merchandising investigations that we propose to carry on, we will pay attention to the marketing for human consumption of these other fish which are called rough fish. Well a pike is not, in my opinion, properly described as a rough fish; it's a good sport fish; it's one of our greatest perhaps the greatest attraction we have for American tourists here. They like to come and catch it and they

(Mr. Evans, cont'd.) . . . like to eat it, and I believe the fish can be marketed and merchandised in such a way to appear very attractive as human food. There is the silver bass or sheepshead, I think those are interchangeable terms, which is a thoroughly palatable fish and can be -- and in other parts of the continent - is sold for human consumption. I believe the market for that can be expanded, and likewise with some other species of what are called rough fish. My own opinion is that the merchandising aspects of all this - the advertising is an important factor. I don't know how the other members of the committee would feel but I would feel much more attracted to a fish that's called a silver bass than one that's called a sheepshead. Now that may be just a particular peculiarity of my own but I think the advertising and the method of merchandising of these things will require attention and will repay attention.

With regard to the winter fishing on the Long Point-Reindeer area, I think the original restriction was put on because we did not see at that point a population which was dependent upon that winter fishing area. I personally, and perhaps it's my own personal fault, did not realize that the fishermen who depended upon that area really came from over near Lake Manitoba. When it was drawn to our attention that their take was only I believe some 50 or 60,000 pounds and that the price in the winter is substantially higher than in the summer time, it was decided that this would neither damage the whitefish fishery, was important to some well equipped fishermen that I met when I was up north at Ashern-- I had a meeting there with them specially -- it was an important source of revenue to them and they were well equipped for it and had investments, it was decided wise to reopen that season, and that is the reason for that.

MR. GUTTORMSON: Mr. Chairman, just one point. The Minister said I quite agree with this problem on Lake Winnipeg fishermen coming to Lake Manitoba is a difficult one. I don't argue the point at all, but sometimes a fisherman isn't to blame for what's going on because sometimes a man who isn't even a fisherman purchases a commercial operators license for a Lake Winnipeg fisherman and in effect he goes out there on the lake maybe as an employee but all the equipment comes from the other lake, and I can't substantiate this, but there are frequent rumours that these men are bringing over small mesh nets. Now it's quite true that we have Game Guardians checking these men and this story may not prove correct but these stories certainly frequent the lake, and I again repeat - I know it's a difficult thing to do but the fishermen aren't to blame for it. They get some man -- I know of one case in particular -- he isn't even a fisherman, he got paid \$300. a month just to purchase a commercial operators license, and these men from the other lake used it and he was just sort of a 'fish' for them. I mean he didn't do anything but draw the money and they were the commercial operators and they had big equipment; they had snowmobiles and much better equipment than many of our local men and that's what caused a lot of the trouble on the lake and the Minister knows - we had that meeting in Portage la Prairie and he heard the views. One other thing I slipped up a while ago. I was going to ask the Minister, has he given any thought to the possibility of establishing a cannery for rough fish on the Lake? I meant to ask him a while ago and it slipped my mind.

MR. JOHNSON (Gimli): Mr. Chairman, these fishermen from Lake Winnipeg that go over to Lake Manitoba. The Honourable Member for St. George knows I know each one of these men. They're neighbours of mine in Gimli. They're excellent fishermen - first class men. And these men on Lake Manitoba that he mentions, these men have small equipment, they're mixed fishermen, they're not full-time fishermen; and these men on Lake Winnipeg who have the modern equipment are able to go over to Lake Manitoba and they fish there. This neighbour of mine who is a very competent fisherman fished under the license of this Lake Manitoba resident who had no equipment and wanted him and his brother to come over and fish with them. These men tell me that they have more 'savvy' - Lake Manitoba is a shallow lake and they use nets almost to the bottom of the water; they have such big equipment and they do very well; and they tell me that because of their full time activity in fishing, they are able to make a better fishing season for the members over there. And I think it's just as simple as that. These men from Gimli that went to Lake Manitoba last winter to fish certainly never put an illegal net in the lake. I think if they did we'd certainly know about it, and these men don't want to violate the law but they want to fish, and they want to make a living. Both of them are married to girls from Portage la Prairie and they spend their winters over in Portage and the Delta region and fish with these other men - and that's just about as simple a problem . . .

MR. GUTTORMSON: I sympathize with the views of the Honourable Minister but if they

(Mr. Guttormson, cont'd.) . . . don't curtail it, what's going to happen to the lake. You're going to have it so crowded that nobody - it's going to drive everybody out of a living.

MR. JOHNSON: May I ask the honourable gentleman a question? What was ever done about licensing on Lake Winnipeg in the previous government's regime?

MR. GUTTORMSON: I'm not answerable for any thing the previous government done.

MR. JOHNSON: Well, we're doing the right thing here.

MR. HRYHORCZUK: Mr. Chairman, I would like to make a contribution to the debate. I hope it will be of some value.

MR. EVANS: Would it be convenient for me to answer the Honourable Member for St. George's last question first . . .

MR. HRYHORCZUK: If you prefer it that way, it's all right with me.

MR. EVANS: I think it would suit me better if that's agreeable to the committee. With regard to fish canning, there are very distinct possibilities I cannot hold out any hope that at the moment we have a practical operation in sight, but there are very great possibilities in that connection and particularly in regard to northern pike. There are -- it's quite possible to manufacture and can fish balls and fish cakes, and pike are well adapted to that sort of thing. There are other forms in which they can be canned and frozen and exported and I believe there are real possibilities in that connection. Now I don't want to say that we have either taken any steps toward securing a cannery; we have it in mind and it is one valuable suggestion and I'm glad it has been emphasized tonight. We'll be following that as fast as we can. I believe in other countries, for example I believe in New Zealand, they market sharks under the title of Silver Streak. Well it's a much more palatable title and a palatable fish and that's another of these what you might call 'merchandising angles' that we're going to follow through.

MR. GUTTORMSON: I was delighted when the Minister said that consideration is being given to a processing plant and the possibility of using barges. He didn't include Manitoba or both lakes. Are both lakes included for that?

MR. EVANS: The one operation that's being contemplated now is for Lake Winnipeg.

MR. GUTTORMSON: I hope the Minister will give the same consideration to Lake Manitoba.

MR. EVANS: Well, we'll try to find someone to do it.

MR. HRYHORCZUK: Mr. Chairman, I listened with great interest to what the Minister had to say on this particular item and I think it is of very great importance to the Province of Manitoba and to very many people living in it. I was rather sorry they didn't mention Lake Winnipegosis, a lake that produces the finest pickerel on the continent, I believe, and the greatest quantities of it. (Interjection) . . . Now I've said that I was going to be sort of a suit maker here but, maybe it will start something when I make that contention but the experts will tell you, Mr. Chairman, that I am correct in that statement.

Now the Honourable the Minister dealt with the various aspects of our fishing industry - he stressed in particular marketing and enforcement of our regulations which I think are important, but it looked to me as if he was pointing his remarks more in the direction of the utilization, the proper utilization of the fish we now have in the lakes. I would say, Mr. Chairman, that it is every bit as important if not more important, to find ways and means of replenishing the stocks in our various commercial lakes. I had the opportunity of sitting on the committee that investigated the commercial fishing here in Manitoba, and we had fishermen speak to us on all of these lakes, including some of the northern lakes; we had scientists, biologists and experts express their opinions to us, and after listening to I don't know how many briefs, Mr. Chairman, and how many people, we ended up slightly wiser than we were when we started but not too much. There's an absolute lack of knowledge of fish habits and so forth; there is no consensus of opinion even among the biologists or the experts. As an example we had a Dr. Kennedy give evidence to the committee, who was a federal biologist, a very eminent man, and he threw a statement before the committee which found various reactions, but most of them were reactions of considerable surprise. And that statement was that you cannot overfish a lake. Now I'm no expert, but I don't agree with him and I agree with him on one condition that you cannot overfish a lake if you can maintain the source of supply.

I believe, Mr. Chairman, that it is all important that we learn as quickly as we can, what we can do to improve the propagation of fish, and I believe that both the propagation and the

(Mr. Hryhorczuk, cont'd.) . . . available food are the answer to most of our problems - saying again, Mr. Chairman, that the question of marketing and so forth is very important. I might only say this that during our investigations we discovered that the competition on the market for the fish shipped out of Manitoba is very keen. There is fish coming in from both the Atlantic and the Pacific Oceans as well as from some countries overseas on to the continent; and it's not only a matter of finding a market but it's a matter of putting quality on the market that can compete with all of these others that are taking our markets away from us.

Now insofar as propagation is concerned, Mr. Chairman, from what we were told at this committee, it would appear that what has actually happened in most of Manitoba and probably elsewhere, but in Manitoba in particular, is that our natural spawning grounds have been destroyed. Now there are fish that spawn in the lakes and there are fish that spawn in streams. Now just let's take a look for a moment what has happened to our streams in the past 30 or 40 years. I recall in my own days when I was still a small lad and went out fishing, in the spring of the year you could see fish by the thousands in every little creek and stream and run that was a tributary to a river running into one of these lakes. (Interjection) . . . Oh no, no, no, not for jacks. They were mainly mullets and I'm going to come to that because I disagree with some of the statement made here today that we should destroy our rough fish as quickly as we can and I don't agree with that. We used to have, in the streams we used to have the mullet come up - no the pickerel. . . (Interjection) . . . Now just a second, just one moment. The pickerel come up first, then the jacks and then the mullets, but the mullets. Well I -- it's a peculiar thing, I don't know whether in the House when you're in committee, whether you're supposed to take for granted that the man who has something to say is being honest about what he's talking about or not, or whether that's restricted only to us when we're in session and the Speaker is in the Chair - but I have seen them. And if they hadn't been doing that in the areas that the gentleman who contradict me live in, then they've been just a bit too late, because today you can hardly see a pickerel come up the stream and as far as the mullets and the jacks are concerned, I don't think that you can see 5% of the fish that used to come up 30 - 35 years ago. Now what has happened? In the first place our streams are no longer clean water streams. Our streams have -- all our drainage is put into them -- by drainage ditches and the construction of roads -- and all this silt is carried into the streams. The source of the small creek and the small river has been cut off and drained into the larger streams running into the lakes, and today the fish actually have no natural place to spawn in it. Not only are the creeks filled with silt and debris, but the number of creeks has been cut tremendously by our drainage and road system. One other thing has happened to our streams that do remain, and that is that all this water that's been drained into these streams and the runoff is fast, and those fish that do get up there to spawn, and do spawn, the fry or the fingerlings or the young get trapped into potholes and don't get a chance to get back into the lake. And that is happening right throughout the west shore of Lake Winnipegosis. Whether it happens near Lake Manitoba, I don't know - maybe the fish there have different habits.

Now it would appear, Mr. Chairman, that we must use every effort to restore the natural spawning grounds of fish. There is the question of hatcheries and here again, you have no consensus of opinion. There are some experts that will tell you that hatcheries are the thing that we should use as much as possible and others will tell you that we should discontinue them altogether. We had a hatchery on Lake Winnipegosis, a whitefish hatchery, years ago and in spite of the hatchery the whitefish just about disappeared out of the lake. We have another hatchery there but that hatchery is mostly used for stocking other lakes. Now at this particular hatchery, Mr. Chairman, which is on the Duck River, which empties into Duck Bay, to which hundreds of fishermen from all over this continent congregate - that's angling, sports fishermen - even there the numbers of fish and quality of fish are slowly going down. Now the natives living in this particular area have one answer, they think, to this whole problem, and that is that when the pickerel go up to spawn -- and they do -- when the pickerel go up to spawn, the fingerlings don't come back out of the stream until fairly late in the summer or late in the fall. They tell me that this particular stream is full of small jackfish, which they claim is a different species of jackfish than which you get in the lake. . . (Interjection) . . . It could be. They tell me that these jacks destroy the small fish as they come down the river to go back into the lake, and they're so insistent on this that I would suggest that the Minister have one of his field staff, or one of his biologists if he has one to spare, study this particular suggestion. There may be something in it.

(Mr. Hryhorczuk, cont'd.) Now what else has happened to destroy our spawning grounds? The pollution of our bigger rivers and I think that you may find, eventually that Lake Winnipeg may in some part be suffering from that. But there is no doubt that our industries are not improving the facilities for the propagation of our fish. I think it's quite evident in such places as in the area of Flin Flon, where everything is being done to try to keep the refuse from getting into the lake and killing off the fish. But I want to say again, Mr. Chairman, that I do believe that we should put as much effort into propagation and the study of food supplies as we do in the utilization of our fish in the lakes and the marketing of them.

MR. EVANS: Mr. Chairman, I think my honourable friend has just given a very comprehensive outline of the shortcomings of the last administration of which he was a member, in allowing the fisheries to come into the condition at which they have arrived.

A MEMBER: Hear! Hear!

MR. EVANS: He is going to have far better success apparently in persuading us to do what he recommends than he was able to have in connection with his own colleagues of the government of which he was a member. I wonder if he missed the point of -- pretty near my entire presentation was that we must replenish the right sizes and species of fish in the lake to be available for the fishermen to fish. That's the whole objective in hiring four additional biologists, in having engaged one of the experts of the continent in coming here to supervise our fish biological research; the whole object of the exercise is to restore fish in the waters for the fishermen to go and catch. With regard to the research and the matter of the opinions of Dr. Kennedy, one of the first things I did, was to put our biologists in touch with the Dominion biology people in the Fisheries, with the object of having our biologists consult Dr. Kenney, and see whether each could learn from the other, or if we can get rid of this controversy - if it can be called that - of our difference of opinion between Dr. Kennedy and almost everybody else who has made a study of fisheries. I cannot accept, as the honourable member cannot accept, the view that the fishery on Lake Winnipeg particularly, and that's the one on which we have been concentrating at first - we will spread our efforts to the other lakes as our forces are gathered - but we have -- I've seen a fish that came out of that lake, and I cannot believe that more intense fishing would have any other result, especially if smaller and smaller mesh were used than the further decline of the fish and the further unbalancing of the populations of the lake.

With regard to pollution, perhaps the honourable member missed the point, when I said that one of the new biologists will concentrate on the factor of pollution. It is a factor and one that we must study and see what remedial action can be taken later. I might point out that the Manitoba Paper Company has, at their own expense, put in a bark disposing plant in connection with their paper mill, at a cost - I believe - of close to a million dollars to themselves to burn up the bark and no longer deposit it in the river where it comes down into the Bay. So on the matter of pollution, it is receiving special attention in the department and some progress, I will say, at the initiative and at the expense of the Manitoba Paper Company, has been made.

With regard to the drainage that was coming from the tailings of the Hudson Bay Mining and Smelting Company at Flin Flon, I believe they have constructed a weir there now, across a creek that ran through that area and carried the pollution into the lake. It's our hope that that pollution will then wither away and decline and the input has been stopped at that particular point.

I might just for the information of the members who have spoken, give a very rough outline of some of the headings under which the research program is being headed up. In the first place there will be research into what has been termed the "standing crops" of the various lakes. "What are the fish populations of the various lakes - Winnipeg, Manitoba, Winnipegosis and the others?" "The factor of unbalanced population that my honourable friend from St. George mentioned." "The onset of certain species such as the mullets and the carps and other rough fish and their apparent proportionate increase perhaps at the expense of the more highly priced kinds of fish." I might say this, that we hardly know what the situation is. These are only guesses and my honourable friend pointed that out so clearly; we just don't know. We didn't have the research in the past and the thing that I find so hard to understand is that they didn't even cause the data to be accumulated upon which research could be made. Some of it was found in the department but not nearly enough and this is chargeable to sheer neglect on the part of the last administration and I think my honourable friend has pointed that out very clearly in his speech.

(Mr. Evans, cont'd.) The next I believe it to be true.

There is research into new fish-finders. We have experimented with electrical almost depth finding equipment, electronic equipment, for the location of fish in the waters. It is hoped that research along this line will locate not only where the schools of fish may be, but at the depth they may be from the bottom, which will be of assistance to fishermen in determining at what depth in the water they should set their nets -- whether close to the bottom or half way up or shallow. Then there is an experiment going on, some of it last year and some of it this year, with the submarine fish trap. One of the difficulties is that if a fish is taken of a kind of a large size that is too small in a gill net, it is probably dead by the time it is taken out of the water. One of the advantages of a trap net would be this: that the net could be raised, the fish that are too small could be released in the water again and then you could hold the fishermen and the fish companies responsible for any small fish that are found in their possession. If it is quite possible and feasible to return the fish live to the lake, they have no excuse in retaining it and killing it and bringing it in for processing. But experiments are proceeding in those two directions, one with trap nets and the other with electronic fish-finders.

The factor of the spawning ground of course is fundamental or basic to the whole thing. I think the honourable member has outlined one problem which was raised at many points when I went on these junkets around the lakes and that is that the rate of flow of the streams has in fact changed. And we have a considerable research in prospect on the effect of water levels, both the water level of the lake and the factor that he mentions of stream flow, which may be interrupted before the mature fish can return to the lake, and those factors will be studied by the scientists. Then comes the whole question of fish movement. It is said and I don't think it has ever been proved; I have asked questions and they say that no one can prove it, but they do say that the pickerel, particularly in Lake Winnipeg, will migrate from the north part of the lake to the south part of the lake at a certain time of the year. Then the fishing season is set so that in the narrow neck of the lake, the fall season is set to take these pickerel. It will make a very great difference to the setting of the fish regulations and the seasons if it is proved definitely that these fish do in fact migrate that way at a certain time of the year, because we will then have a better idea as to what fishing pressure a given area can stand. And that sort of research is under way at the present time. There is quite a substantial outline of a tentative proposed outline of the research program. It does embrace most of the questions that my honourable friend raised and does touch on a good many of the points the Honourable Member for St. George raised. We will progress with this as fast as we can.

MR. HRYHORCZUK: Mr. Chairman, I'm sorry that the Minister didn't see fit to accept my suggestions in the spirit they were given. I, for one, am getting pretty tired of hearing that shop-worn and tattered expression of "why didn't you do it when?". Because to me it's silly. It's silly! It's the silliest type of an expression that was ever created and because it has been used so often, it becomes sillier. The Minister himself admitted just a few moments ago that it will be fifteen or twenty years before they can expect any results from their work. He has also stated that there were no sources from which this information could be obtained. This particular problem in fisheries is not restricted to Manitoba; the knowledge isn't there. When we started out with these programs and all the knowledge that the Honourable the Minister based what he had to say on today, was knowledge that was supplied from the work that the previous government did. He didn't add anything new and he has been there a year now. Now the whole thing is this, I always take the attitude and I intend to take the attitude, Mr. Chairman, that if anybody on this side of the House has a suggestion to make, it should be accepted in the spirit that it is given, instead of coming out with the defense, which is no defense at all.

The Honourable Minister knows that it is difficult, even now, to obtain expert biologists to do the research work that he wants done. Two or three years ago, it was much more difficult than it is today. And he must realize that. Then why come out with the statement that the previous government failed to do what it should have done? Well, I want to say to the Honourable Minister that five years from today we'll be able to tell him exactly the same thing and we can refer to his speech in Hansard a few moments ago, and he won't have any defense. Because after all is said and done, you won't need it? Well, I think I could use an expression that would be very appropriate but I will refrain from doing it. I think you will need it. I'm glad to see that you have that optimism and I hope it turns out, but you'll also find out that in the walk of

(Mr. Hryhorczuk, cont'd.) . . . life, especially the walk that a Minister has to follow, there are a lot of pitfalls and obstacles that are not so easy to overcome. Now insofar as the program itself is concerned, the Minister admitted that we carried out almost all of those recommendations with the exception of No. 8 -- which is an important one. But we certainly made a start on that No. 8 and he hasn't in one year -- now one year is a solid twelve months -- he hasn't even got to first base. In fact he's got two strikes on him now. If the Honourable Minister and his colleagues had spent more time in their departments during the last twelve years instead of spending them where they did -- or twelve months -- they'd probably have some information that they can't give us now.

A MEMBER: You're not going to take that now -- come on.

MR. LEMUEL HARRIS (Logan): Mr. Chairman, I've been waiting a long time to say a few words. (Hear! Hear!) How many fish hatcheries have we in Manitoba and what type of fish do they stock there? How many lakes do they restock, approximately? Do they restock Lake Winnipeg and Manitoba? Have you spoke of the lakes being depleted of fish, and what is the new process of preserving fish to send away, as I've seen it in the papers a few times, to preserve fish that is boxed to be sent long distance?

MR. EVANS: In answer to the Honourable Member from Logan, the following are the locations at which fish eggs are produced: There is the Clearwater Lake Spawn Camp, which is lake trout, . . . and whitefish; the Whitemud River Spawn Camp, and in that they transferred last year to the Whiteshell for sportsfishing waters in the Whiteshell area, some ten million eggs; the Whiteshell Trout Hatchery; the Dauphin River Whitefish Hatchery; the Duck Bay Pickerel Hatchery; the Swan Creek Pickerel Hatchery; the Ebb and Flow Pickerel Hatchery, and there is additional miscellaneous fish culture work.

With respect to preservation, as far as I know, at the present time the only means of preserving fish for export is freezing it. I believe there has been some discussion in the press recently of some other fish preservative and I am not acquainted with that process.

MR. GUTTORMSON: Mr. Chairman, for the benefit of the Committee, I find it difficult to believe that the habit of the pickerel is different in one lake from another. And certainly on Lake Manitoba the pickerel does not precede the mullets because as the Minister well knows, each spring his department grants permission to the fishermen to take mullets out of the creeks, and when the pickerel begins to come up the creeks they order the fishermen to stop so that the pickerel will not be taken in the trap nets which are used to take the mullets. One point I would like to ask the Minister is one of regulations. At least earlier in the session when we mentioned about the north end of Lake Manitoba, he said the regulations have been changed. I looked into the Gazette and I could find no trace of this order. Could he explain this; who has the say over the regulations? Is it done on a Federal-Provincial basis or . . . ?

MR. EVANS: These fishing regulations are by Federal Order-in-Council.

MR. GUTTORMSON: By Federal Order-in-Council.

MR. EVANS: Yes.

MR. GUTTORMSON: Well then on the point that I have raised on the north end of the lake, had the Federal Government issued an order preventing that area closed, or had you just said you would make this recommendation to the Federal Government?

MR. EVANS: We make our recommendation to them, and they put it through an Order-in-Council.

MR. GUTTORMSON: But the order had never been -- had the order ever been made?

MR. EVANS: Well, I can only assume so. If you want me to check the point?

MR. GUTTORMSON: No, I just wondered. You said it had been rescinded. I was wondering whether you may have made -- suggested doing it but it had never got that far.

MR. EVANS: You're speaking about the Long Point-Reindeer area? That will effect next winters fishing?

MR. GUTTORMSON: That's right.

MR. EVANS: The Order in-Council will be passed. When it's passed, we of course are advised and then we print the regulations and send them to the Prairie Fisheries Federation (I believe) that's the federation of the companies who in turn pass them out to the fishermen who work with them.

MR. GUTTORMSON: Well, the point -- you missed the point that I was getting at.

(Mr. Guttormson, cont'd.) . . . Was the order ever made by the Federal Government, or was it just -- did you issue the instructions to the fishermen that this recommendation was going to be made by the Provincial Government to the Federal Government? (Mr. Evans: that's it) But the order had never been made then?

MR. EVANS: I can't say whether up to this moment it has been made but it will be made in time for the winter fishing season this year.

MR. PETER WAGNER (Fisher): Mr. Chairman, we'll leave the fish spawning to the Honourable members which come first. Let them debate it at their own conservative time. But -- in the early session of June, I asked the Honourable Minister the question, how the Treaty Indians were affected in fishing on the Fisher River and Pequis Reserves? Once the lake was closed, they didn't have no way of getting employment. And the Honourable Minister answered me in this manner, that there was some employment through the road-building, and then it was further under study whether any compensation will be given to these people. What has been accomplished since that time?

MR. EVANS: The main project and perhaps the only one is the extension of the road, widening and extension, of the road to Matheson Island. There are at present, a hundred men employed on that. As far as I know, all who applied for work, all fishermen who were deprived of their fishing, who applied for work on that project have been given work.

MR. GUTTORMSON: Mr. Chairman, what bodies of water has the Provincial Government got complete jurisdiction over? That is to say, over the regulations. I mean, you said just a few moments ago, that Lake Manitoba and Lake Winnipeg was federal jurisdiction. Now what bodies come under complete provincial jurisdiction?

MR. EVANS: As far as I know, all -- I believe I'm correct in saying that all fisheries regulations are published by Federal Order-in-Council.

MR. GUTTORMSON: In other words, the Provincial Government makes the recommendation to the Federal Government and they pass them by Order-in-Council in Ottawa, is that correct?

MR. EVANS: That is my understanding. Now if there is some class of lake of which I am not aware that we have sole jurisdiction of, I'll be glad to check it and find out. But my impression is that it's all by Federal Order-in-Council.

MR. WAGNER: Mr. Chairman, would it be possible for the Minister to say whether work is still available if any fishermen would want to come and work there?

MR. EVANS: I'm so sorry, I missed that question.

MR. WAGNER: Would it be possible for you to say whether there is still work available on that road if any fishermen wanted to come to work? Due to the reason -- I'm asking that question because as far as the fishermen in Fisher River Reserve and Pequis Reserve, they seem to be out of work and without any compensation or assistance of living. I don't know whether they were informed that they could get employment -- did you have any correspondence between yourself and the Indian Council or the Indian Agent?

MR. EVANS: No, we work in connection with the Department of Indian Affairs in this connection. Their officials right here in Winnipeg and our officials work with them, so I think the correspondence would not be between the Band and our department, but our dealings would be between the department and the Federal Department of Indian Affairs.

MR. WAGNER: Would it be possible for you to recall whether the department had any correspondence to this effect?

MR. EVANS: When you say correspondence, do you mean you would include discussions, personal discussions on the telephone and so on? Oh, yes, we have been in touch with them. Now whether in connection with this particular Reserve, I'm not able to say. If you would care to have me find out, I'd be glad to.

MR. SCHREYER: Mr. Chairman, I would like to take this opportunity to say just a few words. I don't feel that I should take up the time of this House to go into any lengthy discussion because there only a very few number of fishermen living in the sovereign constituency which I represent. However, there were some matters which created a great deal of interest in my mind after listening to the statement, rather comprehensive statement, made by the Minister of Resources. Comprehensive as the statement was, Mr. Chairman, I certainly could not help but feel that there were some omissions. For example, the Minister did not really go

(Mr. Schreyer, cont'd.) . . . into any sufficiently lengthy explanation of what his department and what his government -- which is inclined I take it to give leadership -- what his department is going to do or try and do with regard to giving leadership to the fishermen to the view of helping them set up fish co-operative processing plants or the like because it would seem that here is one phase of this problem, among other problems, in which the government could do something quite tangible. I realize that the problem that faces fishermen on the lakes is something that has built up over the years, but it's not only in the matter of fishing but in fish marketing that there is a considerable problem. I think the Minister is aware that some -- just two year ago, there was a situation existing in this province, where fish being sold in the lakes, around four cents a pound was being marketed in the city at 67 cents a pound. Now we of course should be fair and admit that there is necessity for price spread between producer and consumer, but certainly it's approaching the point of being ridiculous when it's to that large a degree of spread. I don't know whether marketing comes well within the purview of the department, but I dare say that the Minister could lend a hand to doing something about this.

And the other matter which I wish to raise was with regard to the overall program which the Minister brought before us tonight. I realize again that fishing on, especially in Lake Winnipeg, is of such a nature that the concerns have to be well equipped and as a consequence the large companies seem to be much more able to do an efficient job. But, I think we must also realize that there are a considerable number of independent fishermen or comparatively small concerns, and I could be very well wrong on this, but it seemed to me that the program the Minister enunciated seemed to be slanted -- I say "seemed to be slanted" -- towards helping out those who probably didn't need quite as much help as the independent fishermen. Which brings me to another matter and that is this: Shortly after the session opened in June, the Minister made a statement with regard to the employment project being opened up in the Matheson Island area, during which time I asked whether or not there was any possibility of further projects. At that time the Minister said he would be prepared to make a statement with regard to any further projects some time during the course of this session. I dare say that there are a good many fishermen, Indian or Metis, living on the east side of Lake Winnipeg who are not in a very desirable position at the moment. And it would seem rather unfair because the south end of the lake is closed down to commercial fishing and understandably so, I think, understandably so. But they are in a position this year where they are just up against it. The fish companies are employing men from various parts of the province, I presume, but especially from areas around Gimli, Riverton and places around there. Well, that's all right. But in many cases this is being done at the -- to the detriment of those people of Indian or Metis or other origin living in the immediate vicinity on these shores of the lake. Now I know that this debate has carried on for a considerable length of time but I would appreciate some comments from the Minister on these points.

MR. EVANS: Mr. Chairman, in the course of my remarks I did say that our first attention was turned to the biological aspects of it. We were trying to take steps particularly with regard to Lake Winnipeg as a first step because I considered the conditions there to be worse than elsewhere; that marketing must receive attention, and I indicated some ways in which I thought investigation should be made in connection with merchandising and other matters of that kind. Then the honourable member raises the possibility of co-operatives. Those who know a good deal more about co-operatives than I do have told me that there requires to be a certain grouping of the individuals who are to form a co-operative. They must first of all be united in associations of some kind, it might be a parish or it might be a particular district where they do naturally associate and in other ways co-operate with each other to begin with. Then when that condition is granted it is possible for those concerned to consider co-operatives. The only thing I can say at this stage is that I believe the encouragement of the fishermen's federation to encourage them to form their own locals will help to provide in some degree at least, that first the grouping of the people together having them in association with each other and in cohesive groups in which co-operatives could grow. I think the whole question of marketing, of price spreads as was raised by perhaps the Honourable Member from Inkster, and other things do require to be looked into. We have not done it so far; we plan to. I think it is an important aspect and must indeed be studied.

Then with regard to -- I am not quite sure that I understood the honourable member's

(Mr. Evans, cont'd.) . . . remarks about the measures that we have taken being slanted towards certain interests in the fishing industry and not toward the individual fisherman. The only thing I can say in that connection is this, that our object has been to restore and replenish the fish in the lake which is of course of equal advantage to the individual fisherman as in contrast with either the organized companies or the employed fisherman. The biological work is in the interest of the lake itself, restoring the right kinds and sizes of fish in the lake; and certainly there is no intention to slant it either toward the individual fisherman or towards those who work for companies, but to restore the fish themselves.

With regard to further employment projects, the honourable member has indicated what's a real difficulty, and that is to find works that needs to be performed on the east side of the lake and thus afford employment opportunities. We do hope that Indians or others living on the east side of the lake may be able to come across in the near future and obtain work on the roads to resources program, and I am in close touch with my honourable colleague, the Minister of Labour with regard to fishing opportunities for them. As a matter of fact his officials who handle the winter works program have been working in securing employment for the fishermen who are now employed in the Matheson Island road. By no means have we advanced as far as we hope to -- we are making progress in that direction -- I believe that these things must be followed further.

MR. CAMPBELL: Mr. Chairman, like the Honourable Member for Logan, I've been a long time trying to get into this debate, but sitting in one of these front row seats, I am handicapped a little bit as to watching the people who are wanting to rise and I've been interested in the debate that's proceeded. I have found through the years in this House that the most lengthy discussions usually take place on education, agriculture and fisheries. For some reason those subjects are ones that nearly everyone in the House seems to consider himself an expert on or if not an expert at least of great interest, and year after year this fisheries discussion has continued to engage a lot of the attention of the honourable members. I guess I have to plead guilty to having taken part on practically every occasion because my constituency is at the south end of Lake Manitoba; a considerable number of people make all or a large portion of their livelihood from the fishing industry, and I have -- while laying no pretense at all to being in the expert category, I have tried to keep pretty close to it. And I certainly have been disturbed by the suggestions that the Honourable the Minister has been making with regard to the serious situation that he alleges that the fishing industry is in the Province of Manitoba. I would certainly agree with what the Honourable, the Member for Ethelbert-Plains said a little while ago that I think the Minister should devote his time to more productive measures than blaming the last government which he seems to go out of his way to do. That's not characteristic of my honourable friend and I would counsel him to not continue in the practice. I think it's not borne out by the facts as presented in the report that he has laid before the legislature this year, because the Honourable, the Member for Inkster has already referred to the table on page 67 which gives the total production and value of fish produced in Manitoba for the period of ten years from '48-'49 to '57-'58. That does not include the year just passed of course, but I suppose that the Honourable, the Minister has facts and figures were put out, and I would guess that they are probably not far off from the totals that are shown there.

Mr. Chairman, when the Minister insists on blaming practices of the past -- policies of the past -- for what he seems to consider is a deplorable situation, he himself admitted during the course of his statement that it's expected that there will be an increase in the whitefish catch in Lake Winnipeg this year. Well now if there is expected to be an increase this year, that's not due to the policies that my honourable friend is putting into effect. It must have been on the way before the advent of his Ministry, and because this particular subject was coming up for discussion, because I had been concerned about the statements that the Minister has been making in this House and to the public, I took the trouble to go up to the fishing area over the weekend and make some enquiries there. The Minister has not reported to the House as far as I know, what he has heard from the fishing operations this year. He told us that Dr. Doan by an examination of the scales of the fish had decided that there would likely be a better catch this year but he didn't tell us what has happened in fact up-to-date. I am told that the catch is good this year, and while the year is not finished yet and changes can take place, I think that that is the complete answer to the fact that these variations do take place through the years, and I trust that we are

(Mr. Campbell, cont'd.) . . . coming back into a better season so far as Lake Winnipeg is concerned, and that seems to be borne out by the experience up-to-date. If you look at this ten year period, you will see that the fluctuations while considerable are not as great as one might expect. The last year that we have here is actually above the ten year average and I think that that is the more remarkable when you take into account the fact that there has been a general tendency toward decrease in the size of the mesh. Now if the tendency had been the other way and the mesh had been getting smaller all the time, then there might be an argument raised that the increase in total poundage produced was the result of a lowering of the size of the mesh and that that resulted in more fish being taken. The fact is with I think the whitefish season on Lake Winnipeg recently being perhaps the exception, that the general tendency has been the other way. And Mr. Chairman, once again I say that there's a simple solution to this very complex question. Not the only solution of course, but one of the main solutions is to keep very closely in touch with the size of mesh and that has to be fitted -- and there are people who are very very well acquainted with this subject, I think, who can give the best of advice on the subject -- that has to be fitted as I understand it with the two considerations in mind: Number one, to allow the species of fish that you're taking to have at least one or preferably two or three years of spawning life because with all due respect to the hatcheries and all the rest, the natural spawning whether it be in creeks or elsewhere -- and I still maintain that the pickerel spawn mainly on the shore and the lake beds rather than up the stream -- but the natural spawning is a real rejuvenation of the lake in my opinion, and the policy should be, I would suggest, and I think has been, to allow the fish to mature at least to the extent that they will have spawned once or twice, better two, three, or four times if the resulting size of the fish is still of the size that is suitable to the market. Because my understanding is that through the years that the same thing has been taking place in the fish business as has taken place with beef and with poultry and other foods, that families generally speaking, have been smaller in recent years than they used to be many years ago, and whether it be poultry or beef or fish, that the housewife has been tending toward smaller cuts; and I believe that the size of mesh has always had to take in good practice those two requirements into consideration.

Now, Mr. Chairman, there are a lot of other matters that I intended to mention but it's a late hour, I am not going to delay the committee unduly, but I think that one should, to bolster my argument -- that these, I don't know that cycle is the right word, but these changing conditions have existed a long time on the different lakes of Manitoba -- to bolster my argument that we're not facing anything like the crisis that has been represented here. I need read only from the report that's been presented to us. I'll leave out the sturgeon fishing because sturgeon fishing has not been in the vogue for very long in Manitoba. It was banned for a long time. But with regard to Lake Winnipegosis and Dauphin the report represents an increase, a considerable increase. In fact 20% up as I read it in the last year. In Lake Manitoba more than 25% up. An speaking of Lake Manitoba I want to say to the Minister that that's one place where the people from the various areas at the south end of Lake Manitoba have co-operated together, and they have worked very closely together, and they have -- I think you'll find, that there's no lake, no part of any lake in Manitoba where the regulations with regard to size of mesh are observed better than at the south end of Lake Manitoba. Because the people have found out there years ago that it's in their own interests to adopt and use the size of mesh that has been worked out between the officials of the department and themselves, and there have been many, many meetings of the officials of the department with them through the years in order to get those two important qualifications met, of giving the major fish species that they want there an opportunity to spawn one or two or three years and yet have a size of fish that the housewife likes. And speaking of changes that take place in the lake, I well remember when the fishermen at the south end of Lake Manitoba and the officials predicted that that lake was becoming a sauger lake rather than a pickerel one as it had been some years before -- that a change was taking place and pretty soon it was going to be largely sauger -- and yet, if you look at the report in here for the last year under discussion we are back to where in Lake Manitoba there were more pickerel taken than there were saugers. And those changes do take place and I don't care how many biologists you have on the job, I don't think that you're going to change these natural fluctuations and changes in the production pattern.

Now in the Winnipeg River -- no that's sturgeons, we'll leave that out.

(Mr. Campbell, cont'd.) . . .

So far as the northern lakes are concerned, there is an increase between 20% and 25% up and so on all along the line which must mean of course that Lake Winnipeg which is the biggest producer of all has been down. I don't notice the -- Yes, Lake Winnipeg is 10% down and of course that 10% perhaps makes up completely for the other increases that I mention, but the over-all situation is given here in the report and I do not think it is anything like as pessimistic as the Honourable the Minister would have us to believe.

Now my closing word, at least for this time, will be to agree with what the Honourable Member for St. George said -- and here I see my Honourable Friend from Gimli looking at me pretty fixedly -- to agree with what the Honourable Member for St. George said regarding the invasion of Lake Manitoba by Lake Winnipeg fishermen. The Minister has said that it is the policy of the department to try to restrict so far as is fair and equitable the fishing to the local people and ones who have been fishing there for a considerable length of time. (Interjection) Yes, that's what I understood him to say. And the Honourable the Minister will know, and I'm quite sure that the same thing has likely happened on Lake Winnipeg, certainly as far as Lake Manitoba is concerned, there have been quite a reduction in licenses over the years, and I think that's a fair policy, admittedly it's difficult to enforce, but I think it's fair. It's a form of protection that's true, but I think it has to be put into effect in that area and if my honourable friend says that Lake Winnipeg has never been protected in that way then I would have no objection at all to a similar policy being put into effect there. And in the meantime I suggest to the Minister that that is the correct policy. It was in effect I think he will agree, before he took over the present office; I think it is a proper policy under the circumstances. I would suggest to him that the one way -- it may not be the only answer -- but one way to get rid of the difficulty out in that south end of Lake Manitoba about fishermen from other areas would be to disperse entirely with the hired men's license. Get rid of it completely.

MR. JOHNSON (Gimli): Mr. Chairman, concerning the invasion of Lake Manitoba by Lake Winnipeg fishermen, I would like to give some of the background leading up to this. Why are Lake Winnipeg fishermen forced to make a living in the winter months to go to Lake Manitoba? Now the story I'm going to tell is the story which any fisherman on Lake Winnipeg can tell. It's a story that I know because I know these people. My grandfather fished on this lake. The children and grandchildren of these people are well known to me, and when Chrismander Benjaminson was the first man to ever dip a net in Lake Winnipeg in 1876 on October 16th, that is in the northern part of the lake, he caught a goldeye for which he -- John Taylor, the agent coming up on the Red River barge with the Icelandic settlers paid Mr. Benjaminson a \$1.00 bill which he kept all his life -- it's the biggest amount of money he ever got for a fish until he died. What is the history of our Lake Winnipeg. The history is this. That in the early days of extreme hardship on this lake, Lake Winnipeg, the early settlers learned to fish -- these Icelandic people from the old country -- did not know how to do fresh water fishing. They were deep sea fishermen in the old land, and they learned to fish from the Indians and away back in the 80's and the 90's, five inch mesh was an arbitrary size which was picked without any research whatsoever, and these men went up in the summer in the north end of the lake and they caught jumbo whitefish by the score. They were on five inch. As far back as 1890 there was I believe, nine million pounds of fish caught on Lake Winnipeg. Today there are thousands of fishermen on the lake. And as time went on these fishermen, new settlers with their hardships -- in the winter they ran behind dogs for days and days on end in trying to get their fish in. It was all frozen in those days, and in the summer largely salted. This lake is a big lake. The fishermen were not organized on this lake. Gradually the slow freighters came in, coming around to the stations in the summer and gradually big freighting outfits developed in the winter where companies would move in and pick up this fish, and they give the fishermen what they felt they could pay him. He was up there, disorganized, in different pockets around the lake taking what he got for his fish. There was a time, Mr. Chairman, when these fishermen got 2¢ a pound for fish on this lake. In 1922 the fishermen formed a fishermen's pool. The story of that pool is a sad tale indeed. That pool, many fishermen in joining that pool put their resources into it and were extremely hopeful that this would help them in marketing their fish over the year. That failed, and failed miserably, and many fishermen lost his resources. As time went on after that they became more disorganized. There was more organization of

(Mr. Johnson, cont'd.) . . . companies and the companies multiplied. Up until 1932 Thor Goodman kept law and order on the lake himself, alone. Five inch mesh prevailed on the lake. It was an unwritten rule amongst those older Icelandic fishermen and others on the north end that you just didn't put down an illegal net next to one another. You used five inch mesh. As the companies multiplied and competition became greater, small mesh appeared and the war was on.

In 1941, and I have no objection to this, they decided to issue pickerel licences to people along the lake who were bona fide settlers. Up to 2,500 pounds of pickerel could be caught by these men. That's fine. We have no objections to that, the bona fide settler catching 2,500 pounds of pickerel in front of his house. The Indian people tell me those days before this time the men had their little boats and their little white boat and oars and caught enough fish for their needs and sold a little. These pockets appeared. But what happened -- they were called pickerel pockets -- and the government said, you can fish off shore for a certain distance and you can get 2,500 pounds of pickerel only and that is how it started. Gradually when the price of whites was higher, the men started to fish whites. Also they could fish with 3 3/4 to 4 1/4 inch mesh along the edges. The white fishermen is out in the middle of the stream with five inch mesh. As competition became greater, companies started moving in people as bona fide settlers and pretty soon the 2,500 pound limit was gone, pretty soon everything was gone off shore, it didn't matter how far. And that happened in 1941. You look up the records and you'll see the number of licenses, how they multiplied from '41 to '46. And then just at the time the fish was failing and these pockets were multiplying and they were coming closer up to the centre of the lake, the white fishermen, he was in a squeeze, and they say to you, some of the m, fishermen are crooks. They're not crooks. They were forced to be crooks. They were forced to compete for their living, so they started using smaller mesh. My friends in Gimli will tell me they took four and five boxes of illegal mesh up every year until this year, with their legal mesh and ran the gauntlet. They were infuriated because here was a pickerel pocket at the bottom of Sturgeon Bay. Biologists and so on were not telling them anything concrete. The Kennedy report was utterly reputed as the honourable member mentioned, by most fishermen.

Then the marketing appraiser coming north. Well, it got so bad two years ago when the fishermen sitting home in Gimli suddenly heard that there were men fishing at the mouth of the Dauphin River hatchery on the 24th of May last year. This broke their hearts. A lot of the men going out that year -- my neighbours, good fishermen, independent fishermen on their own -- got out into the middle of the lake and after two weeks gave up. By this time the pockets were all around them. The independent fisherman was losing out gradually. He said there's only one cure to this lake, either we close her down or we restore law and order and we get rid of these pockets. Not only that we have to improve our marketing; we need access roads along the lake. The day of the slow freighter, Mr. Chairman, is slowly going to come to an end. When the independent fisherman can go out with legal nets and catch his fish and come in through access -- put it off at the north end of the lake on an access road, such as north of Riverton there to Matheson Island, then he can market his fish fresher and he can gain.

I had a lot to do with speaking to these fishermen all last winter and many of them came in delegations to my home to tell me of their problems. They were getting desperate. They said "we've got so much money in equipment now" -- and I might point out gentlemen that between '45 and '50 as the nylon net came on the market, that kept the production up until the pockets got so bad in '55 that many a white fisherman quit in the middle of the season. Mr. Ole Josephson, who told me I could use his name at any time, who runs a station at Rabbit Point, an independent fellow who hires the local people there to fish for him, and his son, told me it broke his heart last year when he sat with 2 3/4 inch mesh in the channel area on Lake Winnipeg, picking up pickerel absolutely full of spawn. He says it broke his heart as a fisherman to take this. This is the problem that was present with these fishermen. The answer isn't in a selkirk gauge and Allen Rule and all these gimmicks that we're using to test the fisherman's nets. The answer was in fish size. These fishermen, these independent fishermen on the north end of the lake they said -- "if you put the rules down we'll follow them." And most of the boys are out there today with legal mesh -- five inch mesh -- and they say for the first time in ten years they can breath easy when the inspector comes around. They're catching bigger fish.

(Mr. Johnson, cont'd.) Yesterday I spoke to the chap who just made a tour of the northern stations for his company and he phoned me to tell me that I should congratulate the Minister because enforcement is being carried out. They are catching the bigger fish. The people in the channel area who had everything to lose this summer by losing out on their net fishing, were all for it 100%. On Matheson Island and up through there. A former member of this legislature, my predecessor, a very wonderful gentleman, as the Honourable Leader of the Opposition knows, informed me yesterday when he was in that things are looking good. There's a little hope coming back to the fisherman. But this is the story on the lake -- there's a few points I've probably missed in hitting all these points but the big thing is mesh size as the Honourable Leader has said in the Opposition, he's right, but that mesh size got entirely out of hand and I would like to inform the House that last winter there was not a legal net on Lake Winnipeg. It got so bad that they were fishing with two and three quarters and the only thing they didn't go out with was their wives hair nets. Now they said this has to be underlined -- you guys gotta do something -- and this is exactly what the Honourable the Minister has been trying to do.

MR. GUTTORMSON: Just one point I would like to raise as a result of the remarks of the last two speakers -- and that dealing with mesh size. This is a problem to the fisherman -- they buy what they believe to be a regulation size mesh and after it has been used for a period of time, appears to shrink, and when the inspector comes along he finds -- the First Minister may laugh but this is a fact -- the fisherman finding that their nets are shrinking, because tests have been made by officials of the department, and they've conducted tests and they have proven a fact -- a fisherman will buy nets of the legal size and after being in the water for a period of time that net will shrink.

MR. JOHNSON (Gimli): They'll shrink an inch if you boil a nylon net -- it could shrink up to an eighth or a quarter of an inch.

MR. GUTTORMSON: And they'll thrink in the normal temperature of the water too. I think that this is a very difficult thing to look after because these fish companies or net companies aren't in Manitoba; but there is certainly a problem there and if you take the fishermen you'll find that they're having a great deal of difficulty with inspectors and if the Minister feels he can make any recommendations in this matter it would certainly be appreciated.

MR. CAMPBELL: Mr. Chairman, isn't there a possibility to get away from these honest difficulties that the fishermen do have about -- and I have no sympathy whatever for people who are fishing with illegal nets -- but what the Honourable Member for St. George said is correct, the fishermen have on many occasions bought nets that are supposed to be the legal size, have found when they got them out to the fishing grounds and the inspectors came along that they have called them illegal; and I think they were likely illegal when they went out there but they were sold as being of that size. Now is it not possible to ask the Net Companies to have them tagged or stamped as to size and then make them responsible if they don't measure up, rather than the fishermen?

MR. EVANS: Well, Mr. Chairman, that is a complex matter. I understand some attempt, some years ago and the Honourable member will remember more about this than I do, to take control of the nets in the hands of the people who sell nets. Then the difficulty arose that the nets -- the jurisdiction extended only as far as Manitoba was concerned and, these nets could be bought across either of the provincial borders and shipped in, and we had no jurisdiction. I know that problem exists. I think it's one that bears further study and we will do so.

MR. CAMPBELL: we have jurisdiction once they're in here?

MR. EVANS: Yes but it was a question, I think, at that time of trying to bring action to bear on the companies that manufactured and sold the nets and hold them responsible.

MR. CAMPBELL: I think the real difficulty was that if you went down and said to a company that you must have nothing in here that's smaller than such and such a mesh, then the real difficulty was that some lakes perhaps in Saskatchewan or somewhere had a different mesh and you couldn't enforce that part. But what I'm suggesting is that there be a tag on every net that's sold in Manitoba as to its size and the company being responsible.

MR. CHAIRMAN: (b) (c). Resolution 56 -- Fishery Branch \$305,155.00. Passed Item 12. Predator Control and Research.

MR. GUTTORMSON: Mr. Chairman, is the Department doing anything on bounties on timber wolves at the present time?

July 16th, 1959.

MR. EVANS: Mr. Chairman, this question was raised I think by the Leader of the Opposition some short time ago as to -- about the policy of bounties versus professional hunters. The policy of the department is to use professional hunters and at the moment we would not be prepared to as it were, nail the colours to the mast firmly on that policy; but certainly the opinion in North America and other countries is that the policy of bounties and the wholesale destruction of predators by that means is neither scientific nor in many ways desirable.

When this question was raised I looked up some points in connection with it and would like to mention in general the reasons why the Department favours the hunter system rather than the bounty system. It's pointed out that as hunting for bounty reduces the number of predators in an area, the hunters begin to lose interest because they don't take enough to make it worth while and there is a natural tendency for the population of the predators to bounce back again. Then too there's a good deal of evidence that some people do a bit of predator farming. They will certainly let the female escape - they make take the pups and they may take some of the males but they'll let the female remain and there's evidence to the effect that people have been doing that as a business and not in fact intending to exterminate the predators at all. Then there was always considerable difficulty in determining the source of the animal that was killed - the scalp or the ears or whatever was taken as evidence - there was a good deal of difficulty in locating the source of it as to whether in the areas bordering on other provinces whether it was in fact, taken in the province or not. But I come to more weighty opinions than that and I find in Ontario the Conservation Council of Ontario made an exhaustive study of this question and their conclusion from their report is that the payment of bounties is not a satisfactory or economical method of control. In the United States in response to a questionnaire, the conservation departments in most of the 48 states, said that they had found the bounty method to be ineffective and in two-thirds of the states to the south, the bounties as a technique for predator control have been discontinued. In other countries of the world they've had the same experience. In South Africa - I won't weary the committee with the detail of that - in South Africa and Australia the same story is told. And so it does appear that bounty system has been found wanting in other jurisdictions beside our own and so the emphasis at the present time is on professional hunters.

There is one argument in this that appeals to me and it's this - they have found out particularly in connection with grizzly bears and I know that we don't have so much damage from bears here, but in connection with grizzly bears they do find that it's one particular rogue animal that may be causing a good deal of damage in a particular area, that is if livestock are being lost in a certain area, it will probably be found that one particular animal either incapacitated for doing its normal hunting or whatever the case may be, does turn out to be the danger; and a professional hunter can track down and kill a particular animal in many cases and experience in this regard is mentioned here in Alberta, where they have found that the damage can be traced to some particular animal and when that animal is destroyed, the damage stops. There is some evidence that that same thing prevails particularly with wolves in this country. And so the evidence that we have been able to accumulate in the department so far indicates that bounty is not an economical way of doing it, and there are arguments against wholesale destruction also of even wolves because my understanding is that when you upset the balance of nature in that way, you may find an increasing loss or unbalance. Animals like rats and rabbits and other things may, which are also the natural food of these animals, may increase disproportionately and cause trouble. So the policy of the department at the moment is to favour professional hunters, perhaps an increase in that direction, but not to restore the bounty system.

MR. GUTTORMSON: What professional hunters have you got in Manitoba? I know of one - Mr. Joe Zimmerman who has an excellent reputation. Have you any others?

MR. EVANS: I believe we have, from memory and I think I'm right, we have the two professional hunters but also the Game Conservation Officers do take predators themselves as well.

MR. GUTTORMSON: Is bounty on timber wolves paid anywhere then. The old practice been discontinued? Is that correct? Throughout the province.

MR. EVANS: That is correct.

MR. WAGNER: Mr. Chairman, I rise again - maybe I'm going to get involved into 'bombs'. Has any effective steps been taken in Sleeve Lake area to check the timber wolves or any closer attention been given since I raised the question to the Honourable Minister of Agriculture and I was told that it was under your department?

MR. EVANS: I believe the division is that the Department of Agriculture, particularly to do with coyotes and foxes does deal with the organized part of the province - the part that's organized into municipalities but when it comes to the local government district and the unorganized parts of the province it's a matter for the Department of Mines and Natural Resources.

MR. WAGNER: Well, Mr. Chairman, I don't want to rehash my speech - I believe the Honourable Minister of Natural Resources was in when I was talking about the timber wolves in the Sleeve Lake area and Red Rose and Poplar Lake. I just wonder if he can recollect about the timber wolves that destroyed cattle in the Sleeve Lake area, particularly for one farmer, three heads.

MR. EVANS: I don't -- I haven't had any information on that.

MR. WAGNER: Well, Mr. Chairman, maybe I can refresh his memory. The complaint was given in the Sleeve Lake area about timber wolves destroying cattle, and particularly one farmer lost three heads; and he let go the first head, the second head and then the third head was destroyed which was valuable to him, and he asked for compensation. And I understand the department has no compensation in such a manner so I pressed the need for further, closer check on the timber wolves by getting somebody to snare them and setting the cyanide guns that I used in my own language - bombs - and it was misprinted (bums) and so on and so on, I don't feel like rehashing the whole story again. But I thought possibly when the Agricultural Minister told me that it wasn't his department it was your department, while you were sitting in the seat, possibly I don't have to rehash the whole story of that situation.

MR. EVANS: Mr. Chairman, I'm not sure whether the honourable member is referring to the same thing that I have in mind. Last year a policy was offered to municipalities to share on the 50-50 basis in a program to use the poison known as '1080'. This is an extremely dangerous poison and the Government of Saskatchewan which had made earlier experiments with this poison than we had done, co-operated with our officials and taught us the techniques; it has to be extremely carefully handled with gloves and I believe masks and so on, and we were prepared to put out the poison baits I think in six municipalities which asked for this arrangement. Then the snow came along, a very heavy snow last year and the program was not put into force, but the policy remains and we will co-operate with municipalities in a 50-50 deal of that kind. One of the main difficulties with '1080' is this, that the animal does not die quickly but escapes and goes away either to his lair or elsewhere and dies then you make very few recoveries of the animals, but experience in Saskatchewan and elsewhere has been satisfactory with this 1080 poison and we are prepared to offer the same opportunity to municipalities again this year.

MR. WAGNER: My idea was that possibly Mr. Zimmerman is the only man in that area and he possibly finds it hard to snare these and set these bombs as I call them, for such a large area. Possibly he should have assistance.

MR. EVANS: Yes they do they have the assistance of the Game Guardians. I mentioned before that the Game Conservation Officers do assist in this program of hunting so called - they use poison very largely, that's in their hunting.

MR. WAGNER: Mr. Chairman, was any compensation done for the loss of cattle or sheep?

MR. EVANS: No, there is no compensation.

MR. CAMPBELL: Mr. Chairman, my remembrance is that there are two, another practically full time man as well as Mr. Zimmerman, and I certainly agree with what the Honourable Member for St. George has said with regard to Mr. Zimmerman's qualifications. And then the - I can't recall the name of the second one - he's practically full time also. They operate mainly up in the northern area, although they will go anywhere. Then the 10 or 12 Conservation Officers who have been specially trained in that work, I believe are very good at it too. I just want though to clarify the statement where the Honourable the Minister understood me to say that I was recommending a return to the bounty system rather than the professional hunters. That was not my suggestion on the matter.

MR. EVANS: I don't know what I may have said, I didn't intend to convey that.

MR. CAMPBELL: Oh, I understood the Minister said that he thought that I had been recommending a return to the bounty system rather than the professional hunters.

MR. EVANS: I think the only reference I intended to make that you had raised this point and that we would return to a discussion of it.

MR. CAMPBELL: Yes, I was not recommending that change. What I was recommending to the Minister responsible to look into it, and by the way, is this predator control now all in the Department of Mines and Natural Resources or is the settled areas still in the Department of Agriculture. I rather thought so and it's really the settled area that my remarks were intended to apply to because I thought that there was a problem being faced by the municipalities as a result of legislation that we passed, and I admit it, we passed, whereby a municipality that bordered on the International boundary or the Saskatchewan boundary, or another municipality that took action of voting themselves out of the payment of bounty, has been taken advantage of by a good many municipalities to the extent that I think, in my opinion, it's bringing back a problem of wolves and foxes, that is coyotes and foxes in that area. It was the policy only that I was suggesting should be looked at. I'm quite in favour of the professional hunters and the Conservation Officers and all being trained so far as these timber wolves are concerned.

MR. GUTTORMSON: Mr. Chairman, most of the debate pertaining to predator control deals with wolves and foxes, but there is another predator causing a great deal of concern in the country and that is the skunk. This may bring amusement to the members but it's still a fact. In the inter-lake area or any of that area you'll find the numbers of skunks are increasing in great numbers each year; and this is largely responsible because the pelt isn't worth anything any more, and they're causing countless thousands of dollars worth of damage each year. They're destroying the upland game; they are destroying duck eggs and they're raiding the farmers chicken pens, and if you'll notice along the highway, there's hundreds of them killed by cars on the highways. That's quite true — and this indicates the terrific numbers that this animal — I was just wondering if the Department has considered any way of diminishing the numbers. I know in the Rural Municipality of Dufferin they place a bounty on this animal — \$2.00 a head providing they're turned in by the resident, and the information I obtained the other day was that they had paid a \$2.00 bounty on 325 animals, and it was my information that they're going to ask the Provincial Government for assistance in this matter. Now I realize that the department, many people have asked that the government put a bounty on these and I know that your department is opposed to this, and maybe they have good reason for it. At the last meeting of the municipal men, I know the Reeve in my Municipality of Coldwell recommended that resolution be passed asking that the Provincial Government pay a bounty on it. I was just wondering if he would take this under advisement and see if something couldn't be done to reduce the large number of these animals.

MR. EVANS: Mr. Chairman, the honourable member spoke to me privately about this a short time ago and I made some enquiries. As far as I've been able to learn there's no formal approach been made by anyone asking for this. We have not to this point considered a policy of this kind. Certainly we'll study it to see if there is danger in this regard.

MR. CHAIRMAN: Resolution 57 — Predator Control and Research, \$57,000.00. Passed.

MR. ROBLIN: Mr. Chairman, I move the committee rise.

MR. CHAIRMAN: Committee rise. Call in the Speaker. Mr. Speaker the Committee of Supply has adopted certain resolutions and directed me to report the same and ask leave to sit again.

MR. MARTIN: Mr. Speaker, I beg to move, seconded by the Honourable Member for Winnipeg Centre that the Report of the Committee be received.

Mr. Speaker presented the motion and after a voice vote declared the motion carried.

MR. ROBLIN: Mr. Speaker, I beg to move, seconded by the Honourable the Minister of Agriculture, that the House do now adjourn.

Mr. Speaker presented the motion and after a voice vote declared the motion carried, and the House adjourned until 2:30 o'clock Friday afternoon.